AN
ANSWER
TO THE
PRINTED SPEECH
OF
EDMUND BURKE, Esq;
SPOKEN IN THE
House of Commons, *April* 19, 1774.
IN WHICH

His Knowledge in Polity, Legislature, Humankind, History, Commerce and Finance, is candidly examined; his Arguments are fairly refuted; the Conduct of Administration is fully defended; and his Oratoric Talents are clearly exposed to view.

ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE

Est etiam in quibusdam turba inanium verborum, qui dum communem loquendi morem reformidant, ducti specie nitoris, circumeunt omnia copiosa loquacitate quæ dicere volunt. QUINTILIAN, l. 8. ch. 2.

. . . . . nec lex est æquior ulla
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua. OVID.

For rhetoric he cou'd not ope
His mouth, but out there flew a trope,
This he as volubly wou'd vent
As if his stock would ne'er be spent;
And truly to support that charge,
He had supplies as vast and large;
For he cou'd coin, or counterfeit
New words with little or no wit.

HUDIBRAS.

THE SECOND EDITION

LONDON:
Printed for T. EVANS, near *York-Buildings*, in the *Strand*; and J. BEW, No. 28, in *Pater-noster Row*. M.DCC.LXXVI.
[Price Three Shillings and Sixpence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

ERRATA.

Page 47. line 28. for *preambulatory* read *preambulary*.
Page 60. line 11. inſtead of *before as after*, read *after as before*.
Page 63. laſt line, dele *either*.
Page 70. line 12. after *factious* read *and*.
Page 102. line 8. for 1773 read 1733.
Page 110. line 4. for *diſcerned* read *determined*.
Page 142. line 1. for *Stafford* read *Strafford*.
Page 190. line 18. for *ſitting* read *ſetting*.
Page 193. line 16. after *application* add *of*.
Page 214. line 2. for *flow* read *flows*.

PREFACE.

HAD the ſpeech of Mr. Burke been ſhorter, or leſs open to refutation, this anſwer would have been ſhorter alſo. But when every page is replete with ſuch things as were too ſingular to be unobſerved; when a ſelecting of particular paſſages would have borne the face of a partial and diſingenuous enquiry, it was thought more eligible to be juſt than conciſe, and to refute the whole; ſince the whole was refutable. Had either his knowledge of the ſubjects, on which he ſpoke, the arguments which he adduced, or the powers of oratory, which he is thought to poſſeſs, been unexamined, the part omitted would have been pronounced, by his hardy aſſociates, to be unanſwerable. On that account, the examination has been carried thro' the whole; and the length of it muſt be aſcribed to Mr. Burke. Beſides this, as it contains,

tains, not only an anſwer to this ſpeech, but to all that has been offered by the patriots on that ſubject, it may be of uſe to both ſides of the queſtion; and as it includes the hiſtory alſo of all that important tranſaction, it may not unlikely be of ſervice to remove the prejudices of the deluded; and to eſtabliſh the ſentiments of the well-diſpoſed. Of this I am convinced. It will prove that his majeſty and his miniſtry are engaged in defending the dignity of the realm, and the rights of the people, and be "*a full refutation of the charges of that party with which Mr. Burke has all along acted.*" The editor of this anſwer, hath not kept it back, from a *delicacy poſſibly over ſcrupulous:* but the publication hath been retarded, more than a month, by a fit of the gout, that was not *over ſcrupulouſly delicate.*

17 00 65

AN

AN

ANSWER

To the SPEECH of

Edmund Burke, Eſq;

IT has been a long, an univerſal, and a juſt complaint, that the ſenate-houſe, in which your Repreſentatives aſſemble, is not only too ſmall to contain the whole number of the members; but that you, the community of this kingdom, are thereby precluded from being preſent on thoſe occaſions that are the moſt intereſting to your welfare. Not the ſmallneſs of your houſe alone, the perverſeneſs of your ſervants alſo, augments the impracticability of your being truly informed of what is therein tranſacted. Nothing is authentically

given to the public. Even the admiſſion of one man, who might commit their inimitable harangues to paper, is prohibited. In conſequence of theſe circumſtances, all the means, of obtaining a genuine information of what each ſenator delivers, are abſolutely reſcinded. Ignorance, preſumption, party-ſpirit, envy and ſelf-intereſt, either ſeparately or in conjunction, prepoſterouſly exalt, or ſcandalouſly depreciate the performances of your ſpeakers, according to the diſpoſitions and views of thoſe who report them: ſo that their intrinſic merit is ſeldom to be known. On this account, it is juſtly your ardent wiſh that the patriots would publiſh their ſpeeches under their own inſpection; and prevent the barbariſm of the London Evening Poſt, and other papers, from mutilating that precious offspring which hath coſt them ſo much care and ſtudy to bring into the world; and which you are not permitted to ſee but in detached parts and diſſevered limbs.

Mr. Burke, touched with paternal tenderneſs for your welfare, and conſcious that it is the duty of every upright member to comply with your deſires, unactuated by vanity or malevolence, hath graciouſly led the way to the demolition of that unconſtitutional practice: and hath given you in print that celebrated Oration which he delivered on the 19th of laſt April, with ſo much applauſe, from his own patriotic party. It appears from the Preface to this oration, "that it was much the ſubject of "converſation, and that the deſire of having it printed *laſt ſummer* was very general;" and therefore you were preſented with it *this winter*. You are informed alſo, "that the means of gratifying the "public curioſity were obligingly furniſhed from the "notes of ſome gentlemen, members of the laſt par-

" parliament; that it has been many months ready " for the preſs; but that a delicacy, poſſibly over- " ſcrupulous, has delayed the publication to this " time."

It is extremely natural for men of *a delicacy ſo over ſcrupulous*, and ſo free from vanity, as Mr. Burke will appear to be in the examination of this Speech, to apologize for ſuch things; as others of more confident diſpoſitions give to the world, without the leaſt diffidence or heſitation.

Notwithſtanding what has been juſt ſaid, reſpecting the *means* furniſhed from the notes of other gentlemen; this Speech is not to be conſidered to be in print, as it fell from the lips of the Orator in the houſe of commons. But as having received the utmoſt finiſhing and perfection which he can give to his rhetorical performances. It is manifeſtly on a ſubject not unpremeditated. It is the full reſult of *nine years* ſtudy. It may therefore be juſtly deemed to include a complete exhibition of thoſe oratoric excellences which he ſo eminently poſſeſſes: and from hence his merits may be accurately known, and truly aſcertained. Raſh as the undertaking may be deemed. Unterrified by the fate which fell on Æſchines, when he arraigned Demoſthenes, the moſt celebrated of the Grecian orators, " it is a ſpeech ſo " chequered and ſpeckled; a piece of joinery ſo " croſsly indented and whimſically dove-tailed; a " cabinet ſo variouſly inlaid; ſuch a piece of diver- " ſified Moſaic; ſuch a teſſelated pavement without " cement:"* *I'll croſs it though it blaſt me.*

* It is an admonition of Longinus, that whoever would write on any ſubject ſhould previouſly conſider, in what manner the moſt eminent authors have delivered themſelves on ſimilar

This Speech was delivered in anſwer to what had been ſpoken by Mr. Cornwall, on *a motion to take into conſideration the duty of Three-pence per pound weight upon Tea, payable in all his majeſty's American dominions.* On this queſtion, and in this harangue, the Orator has taken occaſion to introduce a pompous panegyric on his Maſter and himſelf; and to reprehend, with his natural *over-ſcrupulouſneſs of delicacy*, the conduct of all other miniſters. "He tells you, it contains a full refutation of "the charges againſt that party with which Mr. "Burke has all along acted; the ſubject is inte-"reſting; the matters of information various and "important." It therefore claims your ſtricteſt attention.

He begins, "I agree with the honourable gen-"tleman, who ſpoke laſt, that this ſubject is not "new

---

ſimilar occaſions, and emulate their manner of thinking and expreſſion. I have obſerved that rule. I have ſelected Mr. Burke, and more than imitated him, in the paſſage to which this note refers. There are, indeed, both a ſimilarity and diſſimilarity, between Longinus and Mr. Burke, extremely remarkable. Both of them have written on the ſublime. The Grecian practiſed the preceding rule, *and was himſelf the great ſublime he drew.* The Hybernian practiſes that rule alſo. So far they reſemble. But then he follows the examples of writers who are of another ſtamp. In forming this Oration the ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ of Martinus Scriblerus was continually before his eyes, as it ſhall be ſhewn in a number of notes in this anſwer. Longinus was ſecretary to Zenobia, queen of the Palmyrians. Mr. Burke to a Firſt Lord of the Treaſury. Longinus prevailed on his miſtreſs not to yield to the demands of the emperor Aurelian; but to defend her dominions to the laſt extremity. Mr. Burke perſuaded his maſter to flee from before the face of rebels, and to grant their lawleſs demands without contention. Longinus was infamouſly put to death for this virtuous and heroic conduct. Mr. Burke is ſtill alive, and juſtifying that tranſaction, which ſo ſignally diſgraced his maſter and injured this country. Such is their diſſimilitude.

" new to this houſe, very diſagreeable to this houſe,
" very unfortunately to this nation, and to the peace
" and proſperity of this whole empire; no topic has
" been more familiar to us, for *nine long years*;
" ſeſſion after ſeſſion, we have been laſhed round and
" round this miſerable circle of occaſional arguments
" and temporary expedients. I am ſure our heads
" muſt turn and our ſtomachs nauſeate with them.
" We have had them in every ſhape; we have look-
" ed at them in every point of view; invention is
" exhauſted; reaſon is fatigued; experience has giv-
" en judgement; but obſtinacy is not yet con-
" quered."

From this paſſage, it is evident that his ſpeech includes, not only the fruits of *nine years voluntary labour*, but all that could be *whipped* out of him by a *nine years laſhing* alſo. Within ſix lines he plunges into metaphor; conjoins thoſe *arguments* and *expedients* which never can be brought to touch; and bends the *inflexible progreſſion* of *time* and *occaſion* into a circle,* round which the commons, like aſſes working in a mill, are miſerably laſhed for nine long years. No wonder then their heads grow giddy, and their ſtomachs nauſeate thoſe arguments and expedients. And altho' he tells you they have been *conſtantly* laſhed in this *one* miſerable *circle*, " they have nevertheleſs had them in *every* " *ſhape*," ſquare, triangle, iſoſceles, polygon, and

 ſcalenum;

* And I will venture to lay it down as the firſt maxim and corner ſtone of this our art, that whoever would excel therein, muſt ſtudiouſly avoid, deteſt, and turn his head from all the ideas, ways, and workings of that peſtilent foe to wit, and *deſtroyer of fine figures*, which is known by the name of *common ſenſe*: his buſineſs muſt be to contract the true *gout de travers*, and to acquire a moſt happy, uncommon, unaccountable way of thinking.

Bathos. C. 5th. of the true genius for the profound.

ſcalenum. And although invention be exhauſted; reaſon fatigued; experience hath given judgment; and the ſubject hath turned the heads and ſtomachs of the members; all which are reaſons for *his* obſervation of inſuperable ſilence; he nevertheleſs begins a *new laſhing* by a ſpeech of two hours duration, and demonſtrates that *his* obſtinacy is not yet conquered. Such is the wonderful conſiſtency with which this incomparable ſpeaker begins and ends his matchleſs exordium.

However, he tells you, "the honourable gentle-
"man has made one endeavour more to diverſify
"the form of this diſguſting *argument*." What argument? he has mentioned none. But he explains himſelf, "he has thrown out a ſpeech com-
"poſed almoſt entirely of challenges. Challenges
"are ſerious things: and as he is a man of prudence
"as well as reſolution, he dares to ſay Mr. Cornwal
"has very well weighed thoſe challenges before he
"delivered them." This and "the ſubmiſſion of
"his *poor* opinions to the houſe," are undoubtedly intended to be ironically received. For had his opinion of Mr. Cornwall been ſo *great*, and of himſelf ſo *poor*, would it not have been an unpardonable temerity to have undertaken to anſwer thoſe challenges which the former had thrown out? eſpecially when it will be ſhewn how prudent it had been, had he never accepted them.

Mr. Cornwall "has ſtated to the houſe," as the orator informs you, "two grounds of deliberati-
"on, one narrow and ſimple, and merely confined
"to the queſtion on the paper; the other more large
"and more complicated, comprehending the whole
"ſeries of the parliamentary proceedings, with re-
"gard to America, their cauſes, and their conſe-
"quences." It is acknowledged by the ancients,

who

who have written beſt on the ſubject of oratory, that figures juſtly formed and happily introduced give an elevation to a ſpeech that cannot be attained by any other rhetorical powers. This idea hath not been concealed from this ſpeaker. And as he conſtantly adheres to *Martyn*, as his archetype of excellence, what office can be more agreeable to him than that of evincing how perfectly he is maſter of his favourite author. Hence it is he chooſes to *ſtate* the *grounds*. To *ſtate* a *queſtion*, a *propoſition*, or a *caſe*; and *to lay out grounds* would be a deviation into common ſenſe and good Engliſh, which is contrary to the doctrine of the celebrated Scriblerus, who ſays he cannot too earneſtly recommend his authors the ſtudy of the *abuſe of ſpeech*.* A ground may be alſo *narrow*, it may be *rough* or *ſmooth*, *ſteep* or *plain*, but a *ſimple* ground is new. And does it not ſeem difficult to conceive how the larger ground which *comprehends* the whole *ſeries* of parliamentary proceedings, their cauſes, and conſequences, the moſt *regular* and *uniform* of all ſucceſſions, can be a *complicated ground?* and ſince the larger ground does comprehend this *whole* ſeries with regard to America, what occaſion could there be to ſtate *two* grounds, a leſs and a bigger, when the whole is included in the laſt? I ſuſpect this happy thought was taken from the perſon who, having a large and a little cat, cut two holes in his door of different ſizes, becauſe he did not conceive that the *little cat* could go through the *large* hole.† "With regard to the latter ground, Mr.

* Bathos. Ch. 10. of tropes and figures, in the catachreſis, *mow the beard, ſhave the graſs, pin the plank, nail my ſleeve.*

† Bathos, c. 9. of imitation. Imitation is of two ſorts; 1ſt, when force to our own purpoſes the thoughts of others. The 2d conſiſts in copying imperfections and blemiſhes.

" Cornwal, he ſays, *ſtates* it as uſeleſs, and thinks it " may be even dangerous to enter into ſo extenſive " a field of enquiry. Yet to his ſurprize he had hardly " laid down this reſtrictive propoſition, to which his " authority would have given ſo much weight, when " directly and with the ſame authority he condemns " it, and declares it abſolutely neceſſary to enter into " the moſt ample hiſtorical detail. His zeal has " thrown him out of his uſual accuracy. He has re- " probated in one part of his ſpeech, the rule he had " laid down for debate in the other, and after nar- " rowing the ground for all thoſe who are to ſpeak " after him, he takes an excurſion himſelf, as un- " bounded as the ſubject and the extent of his great " abilities."

There is nothing which more eſſentially expoſes a ſpeaker to ridicule than a pleaſantry on others, founded on a want of comprehenſion in himſelf. Such is the preſent caſe. He hath deſcribed Mr. Cornwal as contradicting himſelf in ſtating an enquiry into the larger ground, as dangerous: and then, in declaring it abſolutely neceſſary to enter into the moſt ample hiſtorical detail; and in reprobating the rule in one part, which he had laid down in another. On what is this aſſertion founded? Mr. Cornwal aſſerts, " that retroſpect is not " wiſe; and the proper, the only proper ſubject of " enquiry is, *not how they got into this difficulty, but* " *how they are to get out of it.*"

Such are the words, on which he has founded his charge of Mr. Cornwal's want of accuracy. Do *theſe* words, which limit the ſubject to the *future* means of extrication *only*, declare the neceſſity of *returning* to an *hiſtorical* detail of what *was paſt*? do theſe enlarge the ground " to the comprehen-

ſion

ſion of the whole ſeries of parliamentary proceedings, with regard to America, their cauſes and conſequences," which abſolutely interdict all retroſpect, and urge the attention of the houſe to *ſubſequent* conſiderations only? "*has not his zeal thrown him more than a little into his uſual inaccuracy?*" Not content with this exhibition of his miſconception, he preſumes to give an explanatory ſenſe to thoſe words of Mr. Cornwal, which no comment can render more plain. And then, by the natural obliquity of his underſtanding, he ſucceeds as happily in this atempt as in the preceding. "In other words, ſays he, we are, according to "Mr. Cornwal, to conſult our invention, and to re-"ject our experience." Theſe, indeed, are not only *other words*, but they convey *other ideas* than an intellect merely human can derive from thoſe of Mr. Cornwal. They neither direct you to *conſult invention*, nor to *reject experience*. On the contrary, in ſaying, the only proper enquiry is, *how to get out of that difficulty*, do they exclude experience, reaſon, common ſenſe; and tell you to conſult *invention* only? I will undertake, with the chemiſt in the flying iſland, to extract ſun-beams out of cucumbers, and ſucceed in it too, whenever Mr. Burke's ſignification ſhall be extracted from Mr. Cornwal's words. In his explanation, however, this reprehenſive orator hath manifeſtly excluded not only reaſon, common ſenſe, and experience, but ſhown the impotence of his invention alſo.

In proportion as he errs in judgment, he improves in peremptorineſs. "This mode of deli-"beration, which Mr. Cornwal recommends, he aſ-"ſerts, is diametrically oppoſite to every rule of "reaſon, and every principle of good ſenſe eſtabliſh-

"ed

"ed among mankind. For that ſenſe, and that rea-
"ſon, *he* hath *always* underſtood, abſolutely to pre-
"ſcribe, whenever we are involved in difficulties,
"from the meaſures we have purſued, that we
"ſhould take a ſtrict review of thoſe meaſures, in
"order to correct our errors, if they ſhould be cor-
"rigible."

It is requiſite that I once more bring before you the words of Mr. Cornwal. "*The proper, the only proper enquiry is, not how we got into this difficulty, but how we are to get out of it.*" Do theſe words, which ſtate the object of the enquiry, to be, *how to get out of the difficulty*, recommend or convey the leaſt idea of the MODE of deliberation? Hence it is evident, he miſtakes the *faſhion* for the ſubſtance of which it is *formed*. Is it not neceſſary that a man ſhould underſtand the words he utters before he preſume to be an orator? but to experience I appeal, the judge which he aſſerts Mr. Cornwal hath rejected, whether it "be ſo diametrically oppoſite to every rule of *reaſon* and every principle of *good ſenſe* eſtabliſhed among mankind."

If any man, by careleſsly ſleeping, and leaving his candle unextinguiſhed, ſhould ſet his bed on fire, and waking, find himſelf ſurrounded with the flame, do *reaſon* and *good ſenſe* abſolutely preſcribe, that he ſhould take a ſtrict review of the meaſures by which he was involved in that difficulty, before he attempts to get out of it? If the houſe ſhould take fire, and the engines be ready to extinguiſh it, is it oppoſite to every rule of *reaſon*, and every principle of *good ſenſe*, to ſuffer the engines to play before the proprietor hath taken a ſtrict review of the meaſures which involved him in that difficulty? if a mariner, by an

er-

erroneous reckoning, find himſelf, at day-break, on a lee-ſhore, and that his veſſel hath ſprung a leak, do *reaſon* and *good ſenſe* abſolutely preſcribe that, before he attempts to get off that ſhore, and to ſtop the leak, he ſhould take a ſtrict review of the meaſures that brought him into thoſe difficulties? In theſe caſes, and innumerable others, would not ſuch a mode of deliberation be oppoſite to every *rule of reaſon*, and every *principle of good ſenſe*, eſtabliſhed among mankind?

But although the experience of mankind, and the very expoſure of this opinion, do manifeſt its abſurdity; I am nevertheleſs convinced, that this Orator has conſtantly underſtood, that it is right. Becauſe, through his whole ſpeech, he undeviatingly ſees all objects in an inverted order. And, from this inſtance, is it not a fair inference, that his *reaſon* and *good ſenſe* are in contraſt with thoſe of all other men: and that he is the only perſon who poſſeſſes both in perfection? but he is too delicate to deliver that opinion. You ſhall ſee it, however, in his practice. For were his opinion to be adopted, every fire muſt be a general conflagration of that place in which it happens. Plagues muſt ſpread through kingdoms, becauſe every *rule* of *reaſon*, every *principle* of *good ſenſe* interdicts the means of ſtopping their progreſs, until the meaſures be ſtrictly reviewed, by which they were brought into them. And thus, according to his wiſdom, the world would ſpeedily be involved in difficulties irremediable. Theſe are indiſputably invincible reaſons for coinciding with his opinion, and for rejecting that of Mr. Cornwal. They prove alſo, how admirably his intellect is adapted to *guide* a miniſter who is to *guide* the

ſtate;

ſtate; or to execute that object of his ambition, the ſole guidance of it, by his own faculties. For who can be more adequately ſelected for ſo important a duty than a man who, on *principle*, would permit the enemy to land without oppoſition, until he had taken a ſtrict review of thoſe meaſures by which the nation was involved in that difficulty?

Such being the reſult of his underſtanding, in the preceding inſtance, he adds, " he will freely " follow Mr. Cornwal in his hiſtorical diſcuſſion, " without the leaſt management for men or mea- " ſures, farther than they ſhall ſeem to him to de- " ſerve it." I will follow *his* example, reſpecting himſelf, and all others. I will obſerve him as a ſuperviſor does an exciſeman; examine his accounts; expoſe his errors to your inſpection, and " omit nothing which can give you ſatisfaction." Only that I will not *tread* " the *narrow ground*," but the *narrow path*; becauſe I will not follow him in the *exquiſiteneſs* of his *tropes*.

Mr. Cornwal, as the Orator affirms, " deſires " to know, whether, if the houſe were to repeal this " tax, agreably to the propoſition of the motion, " the Americans would not take poſt on this condi- " tion, in order to make a new attack on the next " body of taxes; and whether they would not call " for a repeal of the duty on wines, as loudly as " they do now for the duty on Teas?" And thus, according to the ideas of this ſpeaker, a queſtion on what may be the events of *futurity*, is an *hiſtorical* diſcuſſion of what is *paſt*; which, unleſs a man may write the *hiſtory* of things that *never* have happened, as well as ſpeak on ſubjects which he never underſtood ſeems to be incomprehenſible. Did Mr. Cornwal expreſs himſelf in a manner ſo incongruous? did he convert a *conceſſion* into a plain of *terra firma*,

and

and poſt the Americans thereon, in line of battle, to attack the next *body of taxes*, which, by proſopopœia, are converted into an *army*, to be aſſailed by thoſe Americans? It is ſo truly *Burkean* in the conception and the ſtile, that I cannot, in conſcience, pilfer him of the merit of that beautiful act of imagination, although his modeſty aſcribes it to Mr. Cornwal. For ſuch is the characteriſtic excellence of this ſpeaker, that his *words fly* from his *lips* like race-horſes; whilſt his *ideas* ſtand *ſtock-ſtill* in his *brain*, like ſpectators at the ſtarting-poſt.

Mr. Cornwal aſks a plain queſtion; "what "would be the event of repealing the Tea duty?" Mr. Burke, in anſwer, replies, "he can give no "ſecurity on that ſubject." He was aſked his opinion on what might happen in America? he anſwers, as if he were required to give an obligation to pay a debt in England. "He can give no *ſe*- "*curity*." He is aſked one queſtion, and returns an anſwer which belongs to another. However, "he "will do all he can, and all that can be fairly de- "manded. To the *experience* which Mr. Cornwal "reprobates, in one inſtance, and reverts to in the "next, to that *experience*, without the leaſt waver- "ing or heſitation, on his part, he ſteadily appeals." You have already ſeen his ſucceſs in appealing to experience, in the antecedent inſtance. You will ſoon perceive a like effect in this alſo; and find that it has given judgment againſt him. For it now appears, that the *experience*, which Mr. Cornwal *rejected* for *invention*, was nevertheleſs *not rejected*, but *reprobated*, for one inſtant, and *reverted* to in the next. But it is the ſingular fate of this ſpeaker, to be uniformly in one ſeries of ſelf-contradiction. However, this is his anſwer. "When parliament repealed "the Stamp-act, in the year, 1766, he affirms, firſt,

"that

" that the Americans did *not*, in conſequence of this " meaſure, call upon them to give up the former " parliamentary revenue, which ſubſiſted in that " country." That they did not, at that time, call upon parliament, in order to obtain a ſurrender of the former revenues, is true; and the reaſons which withheld them ſhall be ſhewn, when I come to lay the Rockingham adminiſtration before you. It is to be remarked alſo, that this appeal is not to *experience*, but to the Orator *himſelf*; and how well he is inſtructed by *experience* has been already evinced.

He continues his appeal to the ſame experience, and " affirms alſo, that when departing from the " maxims of the repeal, the Commons revived the " ſcheme of taxation, and thereby filled the minds " of the coloniſts with freſh jealouſy, and all ſorts of " apprehenſions, then it was they quarrelled with " the old taxes as well as the new; then it was, and " not till then, that they queſtioned all the parts of " your legiſlative power, and by the *battery* of ſuch " *queſtions*, have ſhaken the ſolid ſtructure of this " empire to its deepeſt foundations."

That this ſtrenuous affirmation of Mr. Burke is not the reſult of experience, I ſhall prove from that which experience dictated to an indiſputable judge, the governor of the province of Maſſachuſets. In his letter dated Feb. 28, 1776, he ſays " the *ſtamp* act is become, in *itſelf*, a *mattter* of " *indifference*: it is ſwallowed up in the importance " of the effects of what it has been the cauſe, the " taxing of the *Americans* by parliament has brought " their very ſubjection to the crown of *Great Britain* " in queſtion. To reconcile this, and to aſcertain " the nature of the ſubjection of the colonies to the " crown of *Great Britain*, will be a work of time

and

" and difficulty, even though the ſtamp-act ſhould " be removed to pave the way; the people " have felt their ſtrength, and flatter themſelves " that it is much greater than it is, and will not " ſubmit readily to any thing they do not like."

Such was his opinion before the repeal of that act; you ſhall ſee how it was confirmed by that which followed it, in his letter of January the 28th, 1768; he tells you, "I underſtand that it " is a prevailing opinion, on your ſide the ocean, " that America, if left alone, will come to herſelf, " and return to the ſame ſenſe of duty and obedi- " ence to *Great-Britain*, which ſhe poſſeſſed before " the ſtamp-act. But when the diſpute has been " carried ſo far as to involve in it matters of the " higheſt importance to the *imperial ſovereignty*; " when it has produced queſtions which the *ſovereign* " ſtate cannot give up, and the *dependent* ſtates inſiſt " upon as terms of reconciliation; when the *im-* " *perial* ſtate has ſo far given way as to let the *de-* " *pendent* ſtates flatter themſelves, that their pre- " tenſions are admiſſible; whatever terms of recon- " ciliation time, accident, or deſign may produce, " if they are deficient in ſettling the true relation of " *Great-Britain* to her *colonies*, and aſcertaining the " bounds of the *ſovereignty* of one, and the *de-* " *pendence* of the other, conciliation will be no more " than ſuſpenſion of hoſtilities. It was eaſy to be " foreſeen that the diſtinctions uſed in parliament, " in favour of the Americans, would be adopted by " them, and received as fundamental laws.

" Let us ſtate the poſitions urged in parliament " on the behalf of the Americans. It was ſaid in " parliament, that 1ſt, the parliament have no right " to tax the Americans, becauſe the Americans have " no repreſentatives in parliament. 2d, But they

" have

" have a right to impoſe *port duties*, or *external* " taxes, becauſe ſuch duties are for the regulation " of trade. 3d, The difference between an *external* " and *internal* tax is, that the former is impoſed for " the regulation of trade, and the latter for raiſing a " revenue. From theſe premiſes, the Americans " have drawn the following concluſions, 1. *port* " *duties* impoſed for raiſing a revenue are *internal* " taxes. 2. *Port duties*, of which the produce is " to be paid into the exchequer for the uſe of go- " vernment, are impoſed for raiſing a revenue. " 3. The produce of all the port duties, impoſed " on America is ordered to be paid into the ex- " chequer for the uſe of government. 4. All the " *port duties* impoſed on America are *internal* taxes. " The only difference between the *port duties*, de- " clared to be for raiſing a revenue, and thoſe of " which no ſuch declaration is made, is, that in one, " the intention is explicit: in the other, it is im- " plied. They both come within the definition of " internal taxes; and there are no taxes left for the " diſtinction to operate upon. This is not a ficti- " tious argument but a real one, now urged and in- " ſiſted upon as the terms of a good agreement be- " tween *Great-Britain* and her colonies."

Such is the experience to which I appeal. Such is the evidence which confronts this orator. An evidence which from his ſpeech confeſſedly ap- pears to have been ſeen by him; and acknowledged to be authentic. An evidence that proves that the Americans quarrelled with the *old* taxes as well as the *new*, not only after but before the ſtamp-act was repealed: and that theſe quarrels were not only produced by the debates in par- liament before it was enacted; but that they were encreaſed by the repeal of that act *which flattered*

them

them that their pretenſions were admiſſible. This evidence, to which he offers no diſproof, he hardily contradicts; and confidently affirms "that not till after the revival of the laſt taxation, that then it was, and not till then they queſtioned all the parts of your legiſlative power." Such is the iſſue of his appeal to experience; it gives the lye direct to all he has affirmed. Whether you conclude therefore that vanity hath turned his head; deſperation hath urged him to this affirmation; or want of intellect hath rendered him incapable to comprehend the meaning of the preceding letters from that governor, who, was witneſs to theſe American actions, will you longer liſten to him who thus affirms what facts diſprove; and be deluded by ſuch aſſertions as carry with them their own refutation? but you have already ſeen and will ſee, in a multiplicity of inſtances, that it is the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of this ſpeaker, to *affirm* without *proof*; *revile* without *cauſe*; *defend* without *argument*; and *conclude* without *reaſon.*

But amidſt the croud of his affirmations, he ſhall not charge me with inobſervance on the excellence of his *figures.* "It was by the *battery of ſuch queſtions* of your legiſlative power, the Americans have ſhaken the ſolid ſtructure of this empire to its deepeſt foundations." A battery of *charges*, a battery of *aſſertions*, a battery of *accuſations*, may be a ſupportable metaphor: but a *battery* of *queſtions* is abſolutely irreconcilable with every idea of attacks by artillery. And yet "the ſolid ſtructure of this empire was ſhaken from its foundations by a *battery* of American *queſtions.*" Why will the pertinacioufneſs of the miniſtry perſevere in ſupporting the dignity of this empire, when it is evident, from this orator, it is now fun-

damentally ſhaken? and will it not be totally ſubverted by a ſecond diſcharge of that tremendous battery of *queſtions*? On this occaſion, and in conformity with truth, I muſt candidly declare, that it was a manifeſt injuſtice to this incomparable ſpeaker, to ſay his *invention* was exhauſted. Is it not undeniable, that *he* clearly ſtands the inventor of this new and formidable improvement in artillery?

He perſiſts, reſpecting the conduct of the Americans, after the repeal of the ſtamp act; and chriſtening his *affirmations* by the appellation of *propoſitions*, he ſays, "of thoſe two propoſitions, I "ſhall before I have done give ſuch damning proof, "that however the contrary may be whiſpered in "circles, or bawled in news papers, they never "more will dare to raiſe their voices in this houſe."* Here again you ſee a freſh inſtance of his inventive faculties. He has imagined the *propoſitions* to be two perſons; the firſt to *whiſper* in *circles*, and the ſecond to *bawl* in *news papers*, and then aſſures you "they never more will dare to *raiſe their voices* in your *houſe*." And thus he makes them members of parliament alſo: or the whole paſſage is one piece of ungrammaitcal ſtuff, commonly called nonſenſe. As to his ſecond propoſition, "that the minds of the coloniſts were not filled with jealouſy and apprehenſions, that they quarrelled not with the old taxes, nor queſtioned all the parts of the legiſlative power, until the ſcheme of the new taxation was arrived;" I have already given him ſuch proof as hath already damned his affirmation. It ſhall be confirmed in the ſubſequent parts of this anſwer, and

* Bathos, chap. 10. in metonimy, the inverſion of cauſes for effects.

and the firſt ſhall inevitably follow the ſame road, and both be damned together.

" I ſpeak, ſays he, with great confidence." His confidence is great indeed. Yet had not his *overſcrupulous delicacy* withheld him, his ſpeaking might have juſtly borne a more expreſſive epithet. He adds alſo, " he has reaſon for it." A truth indiſputable, ſince by the aſſiſtance of *that* alone he can entertain the leaſt hope to be freed from the embarraſſments of his damning proofs.

Mark how vigorouſly he advances, ſuſtained by his powerful ally. " The miniſters are with me, " they at leaſt are convinced that the repeal of the " ſtamp act, had not, and that no repeal can have " the conſequences which Mr. Cornwall, who de- " fends their meaſures is ſo much alarmed at. To " their conduct I refer him for a concluſive anſwer " to his objection. He carries his proof irreſiſtibly " into the very body of both miniſtry and parliament, " not on any general reaſoning, growing out of col- " lateral matter, but on the conduct of Mr. Corn- " wal's miniſterial friends on the new revenue itſelf."

This indeed is ſpeaking with great confidence. Proofs which have hitherto been carried into the *minds*, are by him carried irreſiſtibly into the very *bodies* of the miniſters and parliament. At firſt I imagined this image had been taken from the proweſs of Sir John Falſtaffe, who *bore his point* ſo irreſiſtibly into the bodies of ſeven buckram men, out of eleven of his own creation, whom he never touched: for there is a wonderful affinity to be ſeen between that ſword of the knight, and the proofs of the orator. They enter nothing and are equally irreſiſtible. In both inſtances, all is buckram of their own invention. But on a ſecond conſideration, it incontrovertibly appears, that this image of

carrying his *proofs* irreſiſtibly into the *bodies* of miniſters and parliament men, is taken from the mode, which he has repreſented to have been ſo *irreſiſtible* in Mr. Charles Townſhend, and which will be ſhewn in this anſwer.

He proceeds to delineate the conduct of the miniſtry, and on that conduct to carry his irreſiſtible proofs into their bodies. "The act of 1767, "which grants this tea duty, ſets forth in its pre- "amble, that it was expedient to raiſe a revenue in "America, for the ſupport of the civil government "there, *as well as for purpoſes ſtill more extenſive.* "*To this ſupport the act aſſigns ſix branches of duties.* "*About two years after this act paſſed, the miniſtry,* "*I mean the preſent miniſtry, thought it expedient to* "*repeal five of the duties, and to leave (for reaſons beſt* "*known to themſelves) only the ſixth ſtanding. Sup-* "*poſe any perſon, at the time of that repeal, had thus* "*addreſſed lord North. Condemning, as you do, the* "*repeal of the ſtamp act, why ao you venture to repeal* "*the duties upon paper, glaſs, and painter's colours?* "*let your pretence for the repeal be what it will, are* "*you not thoroughly convinced, that your conceſſions will* "*produce, not ſatisfaction, but inſolence in the Ame-* "*ricans; and that the giving up theſe taxes will neceſſi-* "*tate the giving up of all the reſt.* This objection "was as palpable then as it is now; and it was as "good for preſerving the five duties as for retaining "the ſixth. Upon the principles therefore of Mr. "Cornwal, upon the principles of the miniſter him- "ſelf, the miniſter has nothing to anſwer." Greatly confident as this aſſertion muſt appear in him, I am equally confident that the miniſter had not only an anſwer, but a perfect refutation of what that ſpeaker ſo peremptorily aſſerts. The anſwer is ſo obvious, that even I ſhall preſume to give it. An

anſwer which would be altogether needleſs, had this gentleman been acquainted with thoſe *reaſons* for their conduct, which he ſays "*are beſt known to themſelves*," and without the knowledge of which, nothing but the greateſt confidence could have prompted him to *ſuppoſe* an *addreſs*, and to *expect* an *anſwer*. But it is the eternal conſequence of *ignorance* united with *vanity*, that the former, ſeeing but little, is prompted, by the latter to conceive, not only, that it ſees the whole; but that no others ſee ſo much as he in whom they are conjoined.

That no evaſion, no prevarication, no miſrepreſentation of the particulars contained in the preceding *addreſs*, may be charged on me, I will examine every part of it; and give the whole a candid anſwer. The repeal of the ſtamp act was condemned becauſe it was yielded to the demands of Americans in rebellion, and becauſe it tacitly allowed the parliament had no right to tax them. It ſacrificed the dignity of the legiſlature, and of the executive power intruſted to thoſe who were miniſters when that repeal was paſſed. By the repeal of the duties on glaſs, paper, and colours, ſtill leaving that on tea exiſting; the purpoſes of ſupporting the ſovereign authority were kept as exertive as if the other duties had not been repealed. There was no riſk, no danger, in the repeal; and therefore nothing was ventured by the miniſtry, which they had the leaſt reaſon *not* to venture.

The pretence, as this gentleman ſtiles it, was, that it was done "on the *true principles of commerce*, which ſhall be unanſwerably proved when I come to examine the letter of lord Hilſborough. The miniſtry were perfectly convinced that nothing ſhort of conceding not only all the taxes; but renouncing the ſupreme power of the realm would

ſatisfy thoſe rebels. They eſtimated their increaſe of *inſolence* not at a pin's value. They derided the *neceſſity*, which he repreſents they would be under, of *giving up* all the reſt. And they prepared to ſubdue their inſolence, by means of that executive power which the miniſter of this ſpeaker ſo timidly relinquiſhed to traitors, and *they* reſolved to look thoſe in the face from before whom he fled.

Hence it appears, that "the objection was not as good for preſerving the five duties as for retaining the ſixth." The repeal of the ſtamp act and of the five duties have nothing analogous in their motives nor their conſequences. And therefore the "ill policy of the former, the miſchiefs of which were quite recent," was no ſmall incentive to avoid a repetition of that policy; and to avert the like miſchiefs of the laſt repeal. And now can it be a preſumption to ſay that on the principles of Mr. Cornwall, and of the miniſter himſelf, *that* miniſter had the ample means of anſwering the ſuppoſititious addreſs of your Orator?

Yet ſuch is the confidence of this ſpeaker, "he pronounces that lord North "ſtands condemned by "himſelf, and by all his aſſociates, old and new, as "a deſtroyer, in the firſt truſt of finance, of the "revenues; and in the firſt rank of honour, as a "betrayer of the dignity of his country." Could that miniſter be a deſtroyer of his financial truſt by repealing duties; that by the American prohibition of importing the commodities, on which they were laid, into the colonies, had been rendered impoſſible to produce a revenue? can that miniſter have betrayed the dignity of his country, who hath ſo vigorouſly ſupported the ſovereign authority? can ſuch a miniſter ſtand condemned by himſelf and his aſſociates, who hath thus conducted

ducted himself for the nation's welfare? but above all, is it not a ſtupendous act of confidence that this man, who prompted his maſter, to deſtroy the financial truſt, by giving up the ſtamp duty; and to betray the dignity of his country by ſetting the legiſlative authority, like a broody gooſe on chalk eggs, to preſerve the appearance of bringing forth, and yet to hatch nothing; that this man, who himſelf voted for both theſe indignities, confronted by the actual commiſſion of thoſe crimes which he ſo falſely imputes to lord North, ſhould calumniate him as a *deſtroyer* of the *revenues*, and a *betrayer* of the *dignity of his country?* Surely his reaſon was fatigued, when he uttered theſe words; or all regard to truth, to decency, to his old maſter and himſelf had totally deſerted him.

And now I will aſk on whom the damnation of his proof is fallen? are the miniſters with him? are they convinced that neither the repeal of the ſtamp act, nor any other, either had or could have the conſequences which Mr. Cornwall imagined? does the conduct of the miniſtry give a concluſive anſwer to that gentleman's objection? is his proof irreſiſtibly carried into the bodies of the miniſtry? are not all the circumſtances he would deſtroy, like Falſtaffe's buckram men, ſtill alive and untouched?

However this confident calumniator of lord North is inſtantly become "his well-wiſher," which it ſeems his lordſhip in common with other great men did not know, "he comes to reſcue the noble lord "out of the hands of thoſe he calls his friends, and "even out of his own." Ah what tenderneſs of heart does he poſſeſs! he is of a ſenſation ſo ſcrupulouſly delicate, that he cannot drown a kitten, in froſty

weather, unleſs it be in warm water. "He will "do his lordſhip the juſtice he is denied at home. "He has not been this wicked or imprudent man. "He knew that a repeal had no tendency to pro- "duce the miſchiefs which gave ſo much alarm to "Mr. Cornwall. His work was not bad in its "principle, but imperfect in its execution; and "the motion on the paper preſſes him only to "compleat a proper plan, which by ſome un- "fortunate, unaccountable error, he had left un- "finiſhed."

And now this miniſter "who, upon his own *prin-ciples*, in the preceding paragraph, had nothing to anſwer; who ſtood condemned by himſelf and his aſſociates, as a *deſtroyer* of the *revenues*, and a *be-trayer* of the *dignity* of his *country*, is *not* this wicked and imprudent man, his work was *not* bad in its *principle*, but imperfect in its execution." Such are the contradictions of which this orator ſtands ſelf condemned. But let me not give him and his aſſociates the occaſion of charging me with not underſtanding his intention; and therefore of miſrepreſenting him. In the preceding paſſage, vanity, which never ſleeps in his boſom, prompted him to believe that this *palinodia* would *ſoothe* the miniſter to comply with that repeal for which he was contending: and yet you have received repeated proofs that nature has not intitled him, by her in-tellectual favours, to deem his talents to be ſo ſuperior to thoſe of men, whom he oppoſes and de-rides, as to afford him a rational confidence of ſucceſs.

Such being the event of his damning proof, he now "hopes Mr. Cornwal is thoroughly ſa- "tisfied, and ſatisfied out of the proceeding of "miniſtry on their own favourite act, that his

"fears,

" fears from a repeal are groundleſs." *Ignorance* then is the mother of *hope*, as ſhe is ſaid to be of devotion. For on what other foundation can that hope be placed? and if Mr. Cornwal be ſatisfied out of the proceedings of the miniſter, he is the only man, who underſtands the ſubject, that can be thus ſatisfied, and all his actions pronounce he is not that man.

However, "if *he* be not ſatisfied, he leaves " him and the noble lord who ſits by him to ſettle " the matter as well as they can together; for if " the repeal of American taxes deſtroys all our " government in America—he is the man!—and " he is the worſt of all repealers, becauſe he is " the laſt." This is certainly a new diſcovery. For this *he* muſt be Mr. Cornwal, or the paſſage is nonſenſe, unleſs he ſuppoſes that thoſe *two* make but *one he*: and yet till now it was underſtood to be otherwiſe; that the miniſter was the repealer. But whoever he be, I intreat you to mind his hypothetical reaſoning, "*if* the repeal of Ame- " rican taxes deſtroys all our government, he is " the worſt of all repealers, becauſe he is the " laſt."

But what act has lord North repealed, on which to ground this *if?* the duties on paper, glaſs, and colours are indeed taken off by a ſubſequent act, but is the act repealed which firſt granted them, when it ſtill remains in full force reſpecting tea? *if* his lordſhip hath *repealed* that *act*, againſt what does this ſpeaker ſo virulently *exclaim?* is not the effect produced, which he urges to obtain? has not lord North *perfected* the work which he charges him with having left *imperfect? if* he has not *repealed* it, how can he be deemed the worſt of all *repealers* where no act is *repealed?* is it not impoſſible to deter-

mine

mine whether his imagination or his reaſon, his inventions or his arguments be the more ſtupendous?

He preſumes to be paramount in every human faculty. And having ſo convincingly diſplayed his reaſon and imagination, he now advances to ſhew the amazing powers of his ſenſes. "I *hear* it "rung continually in my ears, *now* and *formerly*, "ſays he, the preamble? what will become of the "preamble if you repeal the tax?" What an aſtoniſhing degree of perfection has nature given to this ſenſe! he hears *continually* that which is *paſt*, and that which is *preſent*. His *now* includes them *both*. It is a hearing devoutly to be wiſhed. And were he not ſo *over ſcrupulouſly delicate*, he might with equal veracity affirm he *now* continually hears *what is to come*. Nor is this ſenſe more exquiſite than his others. *In like manner* he ſees things both *out* of ſight and *in*; ſmells the *preſent* and the laſt year's *roſe*; taſtes the veniſon of *this* and the *laſt* ſeaſon; and *now* touches the ſalary which he has not *fingered* theſe ſeven years. He exceeds *the moſt wonderful wonder of wonders that ever was wondered at*.

But "the preamble! what will become of the "preamble if the houſe repeal this tax." And thus one of the American taxes, the *repeal* of which made lord North, the worſt of all the *repealers*, is *not* repealed. "He is *ſorry*, however, to be com-"pelled ſo often to expoſe the calamities and diſ-"graces of parliament." Such ſorrow it is as Mark Antony expreſſed; when weeping over the dead body of Cæſar he incenſed the populace to the deſtruction of Brutus, and of thoſe who freed their country from that tyrant, whoſe tyranny that very Antony aſſiſted in eſtabliſhing.

"The

"The preamble of this law, he adds, has "the lie direct given to it by the proviſionary "part of the act, if that can be called proviſi- "onary which makes no proviſion, nothing but "truth could give him this firmneſs; but plain "truth and clear evidence can be beat down by "no ability." Let me examine into this *plain truth* and *clear evidence*. The preamble ſays, "where- "as it is expedient that a revenue ſhould be raiſed "in his majeſty's dominions in America, for "making a certain and adequate proviſion for de- "fraying the charges of the adminiſtration of "juſtice, and ſupport of civil government, in "ſuch provinces where it ſhall be found neceſſary, "and towards further defraying the expences of "defending, protecting, and ſecuring the ſaid "dominions." Such is the preamble, the proviſionary part of the act impoſes duties on tea, glaſs, paper, and painter's colours, for the purpoſes abovementioned. And although the duties be repealed on all but tea, in what manner, even then, can this proviſionary part be ſaid to make *no* proviſion: or give the *lie direct* to the preamble, when that duty ſtill remains for further defraying the preceding expences?

"You have heard," ſays he, in exultation, "this pompous performance; now where is the "revenue which is to do theſe mighty things? five "ſixths repealed—abandoned—ſunk—gone—loſt "for ever." Hence it appears, through a want of diſcernment, natural and frequent in this orator, that he has miſtaken the *act* that *repealed* the five duties, by which they were ſunk, &c. for that which *impoſed* them. And when he can prove that theſe *two* acts are *one* and the ſame, then indeed, and not till then, the proviſionary part of that

which

which laid the duties will give the *lie direct* to its own preamble.

It is indeed in the power of legiſlature to make laws, but has it the power of making them obeyed but by coertion? when thoſe duties were impoſed, was it poſſible for adminiſtration to ſuggeſt that the Americans could aſſume the impudence to interdict the importation of the commodities on which they were laid; and preſcribe laws to this kingdom reſpecting what they ſhould and ſhould not export for the colonies, and thereby evade the intention of the Britiſh legiſlature? was it not, at that time as irreconcileable with that conſtitutional authority which has conſtantly impoſed duties on imported goods, as it is, at preſent, that any man ſhould defend their outrage, and pretend to love his country? but ſuch being the event, the *revenue* was *gone before* the *repeal* of the five duties. And therefore *no revenue* could be abandoned, ſunk, gone, or loſt for ever, by that repeal. He then aſks, "does the poor ſolitary tea duty ſupport the *pur-*"*poſe* of this preamble?" for raiſing a revenue it does not, becauſe the duty has been never paid. But who, except this orator, is ſo devoid of underſtanding as not to be convinced that the duties, though expreſſed for a revenue, were intended to be little more than the oſtenſible reaſons for that act; that the real object was the re-eſtabliſhment of the ſupreme authority of the realm. Thoſe taxes were therefore conſidered as the means of carrying it into execution; and that end this poor ſolitary tea duty can as effectually obtain as the whole five, or fifty times that number could have done it.

He perſiſts, "is not the ſupply there ſtated as "effectually abandoned as if the tea duty had "periſhed in the general wreck?" if this orator,

when

when he was poſting to Briſtol, inſtead of being robbed of *his* fourteen guineas, had been permitted to retain two pounds fourteen and eightpence of that money, would *his ſupply* have been as totally taken away, as if he had been deprived of all his guineas? and until he can prove, that five parts in ſix make the *whole* of a thing, that ſupply can never be as effectually abandoned, as if the whole ſix had periſhed. But I confeſs this making of *five* parts to be equal to *ſix* is attended with no more difficulty than the dividing of *one* thing into *three halves*. It ſhall ſoon be ſhewn you, how this poor ſolitary tea is exalted into a matter of the greateſt concern to the commercial intereſt of this nation.

" Here, Mr. Speaker," he *exclaims*, " is a pre-
" cious mockery, a preamble without an act."
And yet, in the preceding paſſage, he aſſerts that this very act, which is *gone*, does *now* give the *lie* direct to this preamble. " Taxes, ſays he,
" granted in order to be repealed, and the reaſons
" of the grant ſtill carefully kept up." Were theſe taxes granted to be repealed? and are not the reaſons, the true and eſſential reaſons, of the grant ſtill *carefully kept up*, by the preſervation of the duty on tea? *this* indeed is not at preſent:
" raiſing a revenue in America, but without its
" being kept up." None can be raiſed hereafter. It would be in vain to expect obedience to the parliament, after a ſecond renunciation of all the duties. The miſchievous effects of the firſt flagitious dereliction of duty to their country, by abrogating the ſtamp-act; the former incentives to the preſent rebellion, irrefragably pronounce, that a repeal of the tea tax would in fact be a ſacrifice of this kingdom to the colonies. It ſtands and is

as

as perfect a preſervation of the dignity of England, as if every tax remained unabrogated.

In what then does "this precious mockery" conſiſt; where is it ſo amply to be found as in the *act declaratory* of parliamentary right to tax America? a *right*, that by the whole tenor of this ſpeech, as well as by other circumſtances, it is expreſsly ſhewn, was never intended to be carried into execution. That was indeed a precious mockery! a vile deluſion! an inhuman ſacrifice of a nation's welfare to the private intereſt of a few puſillanimous individuals! "If you repeal this tax, "he continues, I readily admit that you loſe this "fair preamble; eſtimate your loſs in it; the "object of the act is gone already, and all you "ſuffer is the purging the ſtatute book of the "opprobrium of an *empty*, abſurd, and falſe re-"cital." Such is the value at which he eſtimates that act which can alone ſuſtain the dignity of this realm! ſuch are the ignominious marks with which he brands it! The beauty of the figure, in which it is expreſſed, is perfectly adapted to the abſurdity of the aſſertion: *purging* the ſtatute book of the opprobrium of an *empty* recital *full* of abſurdity and falſehood. Fertile as his imagination is ſaid to be, by all thoſe who conceive that incongruous images are proofs of a juſt fancy, he was not the original inventor of that thought. This *empty fullneſs* was the happy conception of an Iriſh merchant, who in an entry at a cuſtomhouſe, among other things, inſerted ten *empty* hogſheads *full* of ſalt water.

Mind how he advances in his progreſs. Having exhibited the accuracy of his reaſoning, the juſtneſs of his imagination, and the acuteneſs of his ſenſes, he now comes to manifeſt his commercial knowledge. "It has been ſaid, again and again,

"that

" that the five taxes were repealed on commercial " principles; it is ſo ſaid in the paper in my hand, " (lord Hilſborough's circular letter) a paper " which I conſtantly carry about, which I have " often uſed, and ſhall often uſe again." Does he carry it about him as an *agnus dei*, a ſaint's relique, to preſerve him from injury? or to what uſe does he apply it? " what is got by this paultry " pretence of commerce he knows not, for *if* your " government in America is deſtroyed by the *re-* " *peal of taxes*; it is of no conſequence upon what " ideas the repeal is grounded; repeal this tax too " upon commercial principles if you pleaſe; theſe " principles will ſerve as well now as they did " formerly."

I agree with him indeed " *if* our government in America be deſtroyed by the *repeal of taxes*, it is of no conſequence upon what ideas the repeal is grounded." But is it not of conſequence that our government be preſerved by not repealing the tax on tea? and let me tell him that the commercial principles on which the other duties were repealed, will *not* ſerve as well in the inſtance of tea, as in paper, glaſs, red and white lead, and painter's colours.

The firſt principle of all commerce, is the employment of thoſe who labour in our manufactures, and other productions for exportation. And in proportion to the numbers employed will be the increaſe of national opulence. When the Americans refuſed to receive into the colonies the manufactures of glaſs, paper, and the other articles, it was diſcerned, by the miniſter, that the diminution of ſale in theſe commodities would leſſen the employment of thoſe who worked in producing them. In order therefore to obviate that evil, the taxes

on

on theſe were repealed, that the exportation might no longer be ſuſpended. But tea employs no Britiſh ſubject either in its culture or preparation. The ſuſpenſion of that export deprived no manufacturer of his employment. It was therefore reſerved. And thus the repeal of the five duties was made on the firſt and trueſt of all commercial principles: and that on tea continued with that judgement which does honour to a miniſter. What then is the iſſue of this aſſeveration of this peremptory ſpeaker, "that theſe commercial principles will ſerve as well to abrogate the duties on tea as on the other commodities?" ſuch will inevitably be the event, when men preſume to diſcuſs all ſubjects who are well informed in none. Will he now perſiſt in ſaying, "that the miniſtry "know, that their objection to a repeal, from "theſe conſequences has no validity, or that this "pretence," as he calls it, "never could re-"move it."

Confident in all things, he aſſerts "this com-"mercial motive never was believed in America, "which this letter is meant to ſoothe, or in Eng-"land which it is meant to deceive." Thus he daringly preſumes to anſwer for the belief of all America, and all England; and yet it is nevertheleſs certain that every commercial man, in thoſe dominions, who reflects one moment on this particular, muſt be convinced to demonſtration, that ſuch was the principle on which theſe duties were repealed. Notwithſtanding this, he avers "it was "impoſſible it ſhould, becauſe every man the leaſt "acquainted with the detail of commerce, muſt "know that ſeveral of the articles, on which the "tax was repealed, were fitter objects of duties "than almoſt any other articles that could poſſibly

"be

" be choſen; without compariſon more ſo than " tea, that was left taxed, as infinitely leſs liable " to be eluded by contraband." But I have already ſhown you the motives on which thoſe duties were repealed; and that he who is acquainted with the leaſt detail of trade muſt know that the duties were not repealed, becauſe the articles were leſs liable to contraband than tea; but for reaſons which you have already heard. And you ſhall ſoon be convinced, that this tax on tea muſt have proved effectually preventive of contraband in that commodity, as well as the repeal muſt be in ſome of the others. " You have, ſays he, in this king- " dom, an advantage in lead that amounts to a " monopoly." In which *advantageous* monopoly, and in one preparation of that metal, this orator is poſſeſſed of a large ſhare. It is in the making of litharge; the *ſcum* which riſes on the ſurface of lead in *fuſion*, and is rendered ſo *light* as to be *blown* from it by bellows, as faſt as it is generated. By the effects of this operation, that metal is changed in colour; and aſſumes, among the vulgar, the name of litharge of *gold*. Nevertheleſs it is as equally *lead* as before that proceſs was performed. Such is the nature of that metal, that, although by art you may give it new colours, ſhapes, and conſiſtencies, it ſtill remains in its ſubſtance abſolutely unchangeable; and is eaſily reſtored to its genuine lumpiſhneſs. This orator therefore being ſo great a monopoliſt, in this ſcum of lead, is it not natural for him to be a ſtrenuous advocate in ſupporting the ſale of that commodity?

" In all the articles of American contraband " trade, ſays he, who ever heard of the ſmug- " gling of red lead, and white lead?" who, indeed! it is a queſtion proper to be aſked only by

that connoiſſeur in commerce, who ten lines before has told you that this kindom has a *monopoly* in lead; and that it paid no duty either on export or import. From whence then could it have poſſibly been ſmuggled? "ſome of the things taxed, "it ſeems, were ſo trivial, that the objects themſelves, and their utter annihilation out of American commerce, would have been comparatively as nothing." The *tax* therefore being of *leſs* value than the *things themſelves*, muſt be comparatively as *leſs* than *nothing*; and then this *non-exiſtence* would have been *annihilated* with the commodities; which ſeems to be attended with ſome difficulty in the comprehenſion. "But is the article of tea "ſuch an object in the trade of England as not "to be felt, or felt but ſlightly; like white lead, "and red lead, and painter's colours? tea is an "object of far other importance. Tea is perhaps the moſt important object, taking it with "its neceſſary connections, of any in the mighty "circle of our commerce. If commercial principles had been the true motives to this repeal, "or had they been at all attended to, tea would "have been the laſt article we ſhould have left "taxed for a ſubject of controverſy."

In his 14th page, he talks of the poor ſolitary tea duty as unable to ſupport the purpoſes of raiſing a revenue. He tells you that five ſixths of the duties were abandoned, ſunk, gone, loſt for ever. It was to his purpoſe then to leſſen the conſideration of tea, as I then remarked; and to exalt that of the other articles, as much as poſſible. But now he pipes another tune, "tea is perhaps "the moſt important object of any in the mighty "circle of our commerce." And white lead, and "red lead, and painter's colours, which would

"have

" have produced, as he ſays, three fifths of the " five duties repealed, are reduced to objects not " to be felt." Such is the conſiſtency of this mighty man of commerce. But then indeed he ſays of tea, " taking it with its *neceſſary* con-"nections," by which it is manifeſt he has conceived an idea that a *thing* may be taken, *without* that with which it is *neceſſarily connected*. It is his peculiar excellence to conceive that impoſſibilities are practicable. But is *tea* with a *perhaps* and its *connections* the moſt important object of our commerce? are the ſugars which it cauſes to be conſumed, the tea-kettles, and the china cups which it employs, of more importance than the exportation of our woollen, our linnen, our iron, or many other manufactures, when neither tea nor China ware employ a ſingle manufacturer of this realm?

I have already ſhewn you that the other duties were repealed on motives of true commercial principles; that the tax on tea was left from *other* motives; and it ſhall ſoon be evinced that the duty on tea was the only one that ought to have been left, when I examine his notions of contraband on that particular.

You have now ſeen with what profundity of judgement he is endued, reſpecting commercial matters. And now you ſhall hear him reprehend and reprobate the miniſtry with as much arrogance and licentiouſneſs of tongue, as if the whole ſyſtem, not only of commerce, but of all government, was interwoven with the fabric of his ſoul. " It is not, " ſays he, a pleaſant conſideration, but nothing " in the world can *read* ſo awful and ſo inſtructive " a leſſon, as the *conduct* of miniſtry in this bu-" ſineſs, upon the miſchief of not having large

" and liberal ideas in this management of great " affairs."

A *reading conduct*, how beautiful are the proſopopœias with which his imagination furniſhes you! Such are the reprehenſions, ſuch the obloquies which are ſo intrepidly pronounced by this ſpeaker whom you have already ſeen, without ſufficient intellect to comprehend that the firſt principle of commerce is to employ the people; that tea being no manufacture of this realm, it was of leſs moment whether it were received in America or not; and that the manufacturing of wool, flax, and iron, by which thouſands are ſupported, are of leſs importance than tea, which employs no ſingle ſubject in its making. Even this man ſo *tethered* in his underſtanding, arraigns " the conduct of the miniſtry, and aſcribes to them the miſchief of not having *large* and *liberal* ideas in the management of this great affair." I remember a blind man running againſt a horſe that ſtood in the ſtreet, who damned *it* for *not* being able to *ſee*.—But ſuch is the misfortune of the miniſter, he cannot pleaſe this exalted genius by doing even what he approves. For he ſays, " had " the true motives to the repeal been attended to, " tea would have been the *laſt* article they ſhould " have *left* taxed for a ſubject of controverſy." This they have done. It is the *laſt* tax that is *left*, and *it is* the *ſubject* of his *controverſy*. But you ſhall hear the whole of this antiminiſterial *exclamation*, that you may draw a juſt compariſon between his preſumption and his knowledge. " Never have the ſervants of the ſtate looked at " the *whole* of your complicated intereſts in one " connected view." Is this an aſſertion too ſcrupulouſly delicate from *one* who, to demonſtration, has

has not underſtood one circumſtance of that which he criticiſes and reviles? "they have taken things "by bits and ſcraps, ſome at one time, and ſome "on one pretence, and ſome at another, juſt as "they preſſed, without any ſort of regard to their "relations or dependencies." Bravely pronounced by one who, you are now convinced, does underſtand neither *bit*, *ſcrap*, nor *pretence*, of all the affair he explodes. "They never had any kind "of ſyſtem, right or wrong, but only invented "occaſionally ſome miſerable tale for the day, in "order meanly to ſneak out of difficulties, into "which they had proudly ſtrutted." Truth with equal footſteps attends the progreſs of his aſſertions. Their ſyſtem has been founded on juſt principles; and as uniformly purſued as the verſatility of political affairs can poſſibly permit. It was begun to awaken into action that ſovereign power, which this gentleman and his miniſter had intentionally lulled to eternal ſleep, by the opium of their ſelf-intereſt. The duties on the commodities ſo often mentioned, were the means by which it was to be exerted in America; when the Americans, with an impudence, that no human foreſight could divine, refuſed to admit thoſe commodities into their ports. The duties laid on the Britiſh manufactures were repealed, that the labour of the people and the benefit of their ſales might not be ſuſpended. The tax on tea was continued to preſerve the ſovereign authority in actual exerciſe. When the merchants were intimidated from ſending teas to America, it was done by others, in order to prove, by experiment, whether the Americans would dare to prevent its importation. The populace grew tumultuous on the arrival of the ſhips; and committed felony by deſtroying the tea. The ma-

giſtrates abetted that outrage by a ſcandalous inattention to their duty; and made no one attempt to puniſh ſuch atrocious villains. In this ſtate of diſobedience to the laws, and to the legiſlative authority, it was demonſtrable that nothing but force could bring them to their duty, and troops were ſent as preparatory to that end: but that nothing of cruelty might be juſtly imputed to your ſovereign, his parliament, and his miniſters, every merciful attempt to bring them to obedience, and to ſpare the blood of thoſe even, who by crimes had forfeited their lives, was made. For thoſe who feared no puniſhment from judges equally rebellious with themſelves; and who by that ſecurity were prompted to the commiſſion of every outrage, a law was revived to obviate thoſe ideas of illegal ſafety, by which they might be ſent into England and be tried. At the ſame time, both exportation and importation, reſpecting Boſton, was ſuſpended by parliament. Such was the mercy of the legiſlative power of Britain, and ſuch it remains, notwithſtanding their rebellion hath been ſince that time aggravated by deputies from the ſeveral colonies ſuperſeding the provincial legiſlature, and aſſuming a privilege to form a general congreſs, which hath uſurped the rights, and renounced the ſovereign power of this kingdom. Even ſince that time means of ſubmiſſion have been propoſed replete with clemency. Such is the origin, and ſuch the progreſs of that ſyſtem which this orator hath pronounced to have no exiſtence, and to be a miſerable tale of a day. And when he talked of *ſneaking out of difficulties*, was it through want of reminiſcence or want of modeſty that he pronounced thoſe words ſo indiſputably applicable to himſelf and his miniſter.

" They were, ſays he, put to all theſe ſhifts " and devices, full of meanneſs, and full of miſ-

" chief,

" chief, in order to pilfer, piece-meal, a repeal " of an act, which they had not the generous " courage, when they had found, and felt their " error, honourably and fairly to diſclaim." The imputation of ſhifts and devices, full of *meanneſs*, and full of *miſchief*, the *pilfering*, as he dares to call it, of an act piece-meal, have been fairly diſproved; but if the yielding to the claim of rebels be a generous courage, and the ſurrender of the Britiſh ſovereignty, an honourable and a fair diſclaimer, they have no ſupport but in the egregious error, and miſchievous tranſgreſſion committed by the Rockingham miniſtry: a precedent, too feeble to ſuſtain the defence of ſo ruinous a timidity. And now, in order to exalt theſe hardy aſſertions by a figure equally bold to the knowledge they include, he adds, " by ſuch management, by the " *irreſiſtible* operation of *feeble* councils, ſo *paultry* " a ſum as *three-pence* in the eyes of a financier, " ſo *inſignificant* an article as *tea*, in the eyes of a " philoſopher, have ſhaken the *pillars* of a com- " mercial empire that circled the whole globe." What a deal of miſchief this *three-penny* affair has done! Ah! what an abominable " deſtroyer in the firſt truſt of the revenues muſt this lord North be, when, by his mal-adminiſtration, ſo immenſe a ſum is abandoned—ſunk—gone—loſt for ever!" Such an incomparable paſſage richly deſerves a comment. 1. You are preſented with the *irreſiſtible ſtrength* of *feebleneſs* that has *no* ſtrength at all. 2. That tea, which in the preceding page is the moſt *important* object of the Britiſh commerce, is here reduced to a *three penny* matter, in *finance*, and is become an object of *philoſophy*, and 3. this *three pence* hath ſhaken the pillars of a commercial *empire* that circled the globe.

The beauty of this metaphor is truly angelic, it is beyond human comprehenſion. The Britiſh empire conſiſts of this kingdom, Ireland, a few iſles which lye near them, Minorca and Gibraltar, in Europe; in Aſia, of Bengal, part of the Carnatic and Bombay; in America, of the colonies, and ſeveral iſlands. In what manner theſe places, which are ſo many thouſand miles aſunder, and lye in ſuch different directions can form a circle, I am at a loſs to conceive. And, therefore, the new conception of pillars ſupporting ſuch portions of the earth can no more form a circle that ſurrounds the globe than the empire itſelf. But it has been ſaid, that the ocean forms a part of the Britiſh empire. This, indeed, unites the parts of the *ſolid* empire, and encircles the globe. But an *ocean* ſupported on pillars? how beautiful would it appear in painting! as the celebrated ſpeakers of ancient and modern days, by *tropes* and *figures*, added wings to their orations that bore them into the ſublimity of the ſkies, ſo does this ſpeaker, of equal excellence in his kind, hang them on as weights to expedite his deſcent into the immeaſurable depths of the vaſt *profound.**

" Do you forget, ſays he, that on the very laſt " year you ſtood on the precipice of general bank- " ruptcy? Your danger was, indeed, great; you " were diſtreſſed in the affairs of the Eaſt India " company, and, you well know what ſort of " things are involved in the comprehenſive ener- " gy of that ſignificant appellation." That the Eaſt India company were in ſome danger of a bankruptcy two years ſince; and that the government ſupported them is well enough known. But that

* Bathos. chap. 10. the jargon.

that the nation was on the precipice of a bankruptcy can never be remembered, becauſe it did never exiſt; and, therefore, it can never be forgotten, unleſs miniſters have the ſpecial gift of forgetting what they never could have known. With what unremitting ardor does he ſupport the ſtyle figurative? The *involution* of things in the *comprehenſive* energy of a *word*, that ſignifies the appellation of the Eaſt India company. If the Commons, or Miniſtry, do well know the *meaning* of theſe words, I verily believe they know more than the orator who ſpoke them. I frankly confeſs my ignorance. However, it is an admirable expedient in a ſpeaker, who wants ideas, to *involve* his meaning in the unintelligible *energy* of ſonorous phraſeology.

He continues, "The monopoly of the moſt "lucrative trades, and the poſſeſſion of imperial "revenues had brought the miniſtry to the ve-"ry verge of beggary and ruin. Such was their "repreſentation —— ſuch, in ſome meaſure, was "their caſe." From theſe words, you cannot but infer that the miniſtry are ſolely poſſeſſed of the Eaſt India trade; and that the Aſiatic revenues are received by them. Is the Eaſt India company annihilated? Could the miniſtry repreſent that they were brought to the very verge of beggary and ruin? Could that be, in ſome meaſure, the caſe when they had nothing to do with the profits of the trade, nor with the revenue, but that of relinquiſhing the four hundred thouſand pounds a year which the company was to pay them out of a revenue of four millions? This ſpeech appears to be calculated for the Speakers in Leadenhall-ſtreet; and is manifeſtly miſapplied in the houſe of Commons: "The vent of ten millions of pounds of "this commodity, ſays he, now locked up, by

"the

" the operation of an injudicious tax, and rotting " in the warehouſes of the company, would have " prevented all this diſtreſs, and all that ſeries of " deſperate meaſures which the miniſtry thought " themſelves obliged to take in conſequence of " it." Here again, the three-penny matter of tea is raiſed to a two millions and a half of money, the duty of which would be one hundred and twenty-five thouſand pounds. For the firſt ſum, at five ſhillings per pound weight, on an average, is its value; and the ſecond the duty it would have produced at three-pence a pound. Thus, the importance of this commodity ſinks and riſes occaſionally; and the orator *, like a didapper, is either above or under water, as it beſt ſuits his purpoſe.

But let me examine a little into the merit of this terrifying account of rotting tea. In page 36, he tells you that the American conſumption of teas is annually 300,000l. at the leaſt farthing, by which he *means worth* that ſum. This if eſtimated, at an average, of five ſhillings the pound; the quantity, which anſwers to the preceeding ſum of 300,000l. will be annually 1,250,000 pounds weight; one-eighth of the ten millions. Hence it reſults, that there now lies rotting in the warehouſes a quantity of tea equal to an eight years ſupply for America, accumulated by the Eaſt-India company in ſeven years, ſix of which they knew that the Americans would not receive it. Theſe ten millions of tea, packed in the largeſt cheſts and which therefore contain the greateſt quantity in the leaſt ſpace, would fill 30,000 cheſts. If you enquire of a director where theſe rot-

* Bathos. ch. 6. Didapper.

rotting millions of tea, and thouſands of cheſts may lie, he laughs in your face; and aſſures you that there is not an ounce of tea rotting, at this time, more than uſual; and that neither the teas nor the cheſts are in their warehouſes. But ſir, ſays the queriſt, the celebrated ſpeaker Mr. Burke hath aſſerted the firſt, and conſequently the ſecond, in parliament. Oh, I underſtand you, ſays he, they are concealed with the army of prince Volſcius in the inns at Knightſbridge.

Audacious as it may appear, I ſhall venture to affirm, that on the 19th of laſt April, when this ſpeech was ſpoken; and on the day when it was printed alſo, there were not more than ten millions of tea in the Eaſt-India warehouſes, for the conſumption of Great Britain, Ireland, the iſlands; America; and of all other places to which tea is exported; of which the colonies now in rebellion, do not conſume more than a ſeventh part. And as it is a well known truth, that the company muſt neceſſarily have nearly a two years ſupply of tea conſtantly in hand, by what means can ten millions out of ten millions be now rotting in the India warehouſes, which would have been ſent to America; and yet a ſufficient ſupply remain for all the other dominions of this realm?

"America, however, would have furniſhed that "vent, which *no* other part of the world can fur-"niſh, *but* America;" that is *except* America. And thus *America* and *itſelf* are two *different things*. Unleſs the *ſame thing* can be an *exception* to *itſelf*. This admirable paſſage exemplifies the *profundity* of this gentleman's ſtudies. He hath taken it from that celebrated work in which he delighteth; and in imitation of another *ſhow-man*, who wrote over the

the picture of his elephant, *this is the greateſt elephant in the world except himſelf.**

" Tea in America is next to a neceſſary of life ; " and where the demand grows upon the ſupply." This alſo is a new diſcovery in commerce, and contrary to the opinion of all other men. For from this obſervation it follows, the more there is of a commodity at market, the greater is the demand for it; and a ſupply is the more wanted. America therefore can take not only all the tea that is brought to England, but all that China can produce. Becauſe the faſter the Americans are ſupplied, the more they demand it. This I believe is a phœnomenon ſo ſingular in the American commerce, that although I am as convinced of the truth of it as of any thing in Mr. Burke's oration; yet I am told that the merchants are in ſome doubt, were the import of tea open in America, whether it would be prudent, notwithſtanding the reſpectableneſs of Mr. Burke's opinion, to ſend tea to that part of the world, if they heard there was a ſufficiency for a year's conſumption.

He is conſtantly improving in the exhibitions of his commercial learning ; " I hope, ſays he, " our dear bought Eaſt-India committees have " done at leaſt ſo much good as to let us know, " that without a more extenſive ſale of that article, " our Eaſt-India revenue and acquiſitions can have " no certain connection with this country. It is " through the American trade of tea, that your " Eaſt-India conqueſts are to be prevented from " cruſhing you with their burthen. They are " ponderous indeed ; and they muſt have that " great country to lean upon, or they tumble up-

" on

* Bathos. ch. 7. Of the profund when it conſiſts in the *thought*.

" on your head." How *dearly* theſe committees were bought, or *who paid* them I know not; but this I know. It is a mortifying incident to a man, to be left out in a *purchaſe*, who has been uſed to be included in thoſe on Eaſt-India ſubjects.

In this inſtance, this univerſal and comprehenſive genius appears to be miſtaken; not only in his notions of the Eaſt-India trade, but in thoſe of geography alſo. Otherwiſe, can he ſuppoſe that the revenues and acquiſitions of Bengal and the Carnatic can have no certain connection with this country, but through the American trade of tea? Do theſe provinces lie in China, and pay their revenues in that commodity? it has hitherto been thought that the revenue is paid in ſilver in Bengal, and thence carried to China to purchaſe teas. And could not that ſilver be brought to England but through the American trade of tea? can the trade of that tea to America, amounting only to a ſeventh part of the annual ſale, prevent this kingdom from being cruſhed by the burthen of our Eaſt-India conqueſts? but the metaphor is admirable beyond compariſon. "Theſe ponderous conqueſts in Aſia muſt have the great country *of America* to *lean* upon, or they tumble upon your heads." If you underſtand *lean* as a *trope* to expreſs *lie*, then he has ſuppoſed theſe Aſiatic conqueſts muſt be carried, by ſea I preſume, ſome thouſand leagues, and placed on the colonies in America, where they will lie, one upon another, like pancakes in a diſh. And then our heads will be effectually ſecured from being tumbled on; and ourſelves from being cruſhed by their burthen. If by the word *lean*, he means to give perſonality to our Indian conqueſts, then he muſt ſuppoſe that, by *leaning* on the provinces of America, perſonified

ſonified alſo, they will be prevented from falling on our heads in England, which is certainly a fact; for if they *lean* there, ſhould their props fail them, they can never *fall* here, be they as ponderous as they may.

" It is the ſame folly that has loſt you the be-
" nefit of the Weſt, and of the Eaſt," ſays he,
" this folly has thrown open folding doors to con-
" traband, and will be the means of giving the
" profits of the trade of your colonies to every
" nation but yourſelves." I appeal to experience for the falſity of having loſt the benefit of our eaſtern trade. And if the Americans are not reduced to obedience, I will allow him that of the Weſt. But nothing in contention can be loſt until the conteſt be decided. And does he conceive the Americans can defeat our troops; the provinces become ſeparate ſtates; and in ſpite of our fleets trade with other nations? but you ſhall ſoon be ſhown that his knowledge of the contraband trade in America, is equal to that which he has exhibited reſpecting that of Aſia. He continues to *exclaim*
" never did a people ſuffer ſo much for the empty
" words of a preamble. It muſt be given up."
I wiſh the orator had explained in what theſe ſufferings conſiſt. Not in the loſs of the Eaſt-India trade it is ſelf-evident; and the preſent interruption to that with the provinces hath hitherto been the parent of very little ſufferings. We have ſeen an application from Birmingham, and another from the clothiers in the Weſt of England, approving the conduct of the miniſters, and petitioning for a continuance of their attempts to ſubdue the refractory ſpirit of rebellion in America. We have ſeen from Leeds in Yorkſhire, in contradiction to a letter promulged by a quaker, that the decline

of

of trade was not more, at that time, than uſual. All theſe are places of manufacturing as conſiderable as any in England. Is it natural for men to ſuffer, and to petition for the continuation of thoſe meaſures by which they are oppreſſed? where then are your ſufferings? but alas! ſuch muſt be your fate, for according to this ſpeaker it is irremediable. I preſume the *words* of the preamble make the preamble itſelf. If the words be *empty*, they have no *meaning*. How then can a preamble that means *nothing* be given up? have you, till this time ever heard of a *ſurrender* of *nothing at all?* he then aſks, "on what principle does it ſtand?" indeed I never could have anſwered this queſtion becauſe I have never conceived that *emptineſs* could ſtand upon *any thing*. Happily, and according to his uſual benignity he anſwers himſelf. "This "famous revenue ſtands, at this hour, *on all the* "*debate*, as a deſcription of a revenue not as yet "known in all the comprehenſive (but too com-"prehenſive) vocabulary of finance—*a preambu-*"*lary tax.*" Hence it is plain, that the *empty* preamble is ſynonimous with the revenue, or *preambulary tax*. And thus this tax, which *walks before itſelf*, does nevertheleſs *ſtand* as a revenue *on all the debate*. And thus the *debate* is the *principle* on which it *ſtands*. But it ſeems nevertheleſs that this *preambulatory* tax does not ſtand as a revenue on its *principle* the *debate*, but as a *deſcription* of revenue not yet known in the vocabulary of finance. The *deſcription* is its *locum tenens*. And yet it is a *deſcription unknown* in all the too comprehenſive vocabulary of finance. A *word book* of finance is a new production. It is indeed as ſingular as this ſpeech, it is *too*

com-

comprehenſive, and yet it does not *comprehend* the *deſcription* which ought to be in it.* May not this notion of a *deſcription* ſtanding as a *locum tenens* in place of a reality be uſefully applicable by the lord mayor and aldermen of London? for example, may not the former ſend his pourtrait or ſtatue in braſs as a *thing* to ſupply the abſence of himſelf, and the preſence of an alderman, and all things proceed as well as if both of them were preſent? Surely ſuch unintelligible and contradictory circumlocution was never heard before this exhibition of our orator. But let me riſk a preſumption to underſtand his intent, and ſuppoſe the whole of this pompous periphraſe to ſignify that the tax is in the preamble, and ſuch as was not known before. He hath already told you of what this preamble conſiſts, "that it is expedient "that a revenue ſhould be raiſed in America for "making a more certain proviſion for defraying "the charge of the adminiſtration, of juſtice, "the ſupport of civil government, and towards "defending, protecting, and ſecuring the ſaid "dominions."

Do you find this tax in the *preamble?* the preamble declares for what ends it was to be raiſed, and no more. And from that alone it is impoſſible to learn what the tax is. Unleſs Mr. Burke *can ſee at Cannons what was never there*, and find ſomething

* Bathos. ch. 11. *Macrology* and *pleonaſm* are as generally coupled as a lean with a fat rabbit; nor is it a wonder the ſuperfluity of words and vacuity or ſenſe being juſt the ſame thing. ch. 12. The expreſſion is adequate when it is proportionably low to the profundity of the thought. It muſt not be always grammatical, leſt it appear pedantic and ungentlemanly: nor too clear for fear it become vulgar: for obſcurity beſtows a caſt of the wonderful, and throws an oracular dignity on a piece that hath no meaning.

thing *in* a box which it does *not contain*. The tax in this, as in all other acts, is in the body of the ſtatute; and this preamble, which contains the *deſcription* of a revenue that is *not* deſcribed, like all other preambles, declares the purpoſes for which the tax is to be levied. And ſurely ſuch a preamble is not unknown to the nation; although it may be wanting in the *too comprehenſive* vocabulary of this ſpeaker's financial knowledge.

Mark how he kindles, like the axle of a loaded cart, from ponderoſity and friction. How beautifully he amplifies on this *preambulary tax*. "It "is indeed a tax of ſophiſtry, a tax of pedantry, "a tax of diſputation, a tax of war and rebellion, "a tax for any thing but benefit to the impoſers, "or ſatisfaction to the ſubject." If you adhere to the grammatical meaning of theſe words, this tax is a taxation of *ſophiſtry*, of *pedantry*, of *diſputation*, of *war* and *rebellion*; and then envy muſt confeſs that this gentleman is fully juſtified in *exclaiming* ſo violently againſt that tax to which he muſt be ſo great a contributor. But then the word *tea* muſt be ſynonimous with all *theſe*, which I believe does not appear in the vocabulary of finance. The preceding paſſage will however grammatically admit another ſenſe; that this tea duty was impoſed by *ſophiſtry*, *pedantry*, *diſputation*, *war*, and *rebellion*. And then the ſpeakers, at leaſt, if not all who voted for this tax, are conſequently *ſophiſtical*, *pedantic*, *diſputatious*, *warlike*, *rebelious* ſubjects. But as it is the indigenous and innate right of this ſpeaker, to ſay one thing and to mean another; as his heritage is large, and he beſtows it with the genuine ſpirit of true Iriſh hoſpitality; as he has a juſt claim to that right alſo by the parliamentary precedent of dividing a ſub-

ject into three halves; perhaps he may mean that this tax *hath been productive* of *ſophiſtry*, *pedantry*, *diſputation*, *war*, and *rebellion*.— It has indeed been productive of ſophiſtry, pedantry, and diſputation, to the proof of which I ſubpœna no evidence but this ſpeech. As to war and rebellion, thoſe were produced by ſpeeches in parliament, in oppoſition to the ſtamp-act, and foſtered by the repeal of it. However, to be *partly* right, is ſo much a novelty in this ſpeaker; that I intreat you to place the merit of it to his account.

" Well, ſays he, but whatever it is gentlemen " will force the colonies to take the tea, you will " force them? has ſeven years ſtruggle been able " to force them? oh! but it ſeems we are in the " right, the tax is trifling---in effect it is rather an " exoneration than an impoſition, three fourths of " the duty formerly payable on teas exported to " America is taken off; the place of collection is " only ſhifted; inſtead of the retention of a ſhil- " ling from the draw-back here, it is three-pence " cuſtom paid in America. All this is very " true, but this is the very folly and miſchief of " the act. Incredible as it may ſeem, the mi- " niſtry know that they have deliberately thrown " away a large duty which they held ſecure and " quiet in their hands, for the vain hope of get- " ting one three fourths leſs, through every ha- " zard, through certain litigation, and poſſibly " through war."

I ſhall not examine any farther into the folly and miſchief of the act, it has been already evinced that the true motive to enacting it was the reviving of the ſovereign authority of Britain in America; that the revenue was the oſtenſible

reaſon,

reaſon, and the means of exerting that ſupreme power. But without having recourſe to thoſe particulars, I will examine it as a revenue act alone. Before the time of its being paſſed, every pound of tea, that was exported to America, went from England one ſhilling dearer, than after the act was made. This ſhilling was taken off, and on the teas being landed in America they paid three-pence per pound weight. Teas that, ſince the alteration, may be exported at half a crown a pound, were, before it, with the ſhilling, at the price of three and ſix-pence. The ſame teas, with the three-pence duty, are now worth two ſhillings and nine-pence in the colonies. The Americans paying the former ſhilling duty in the price, paid forty per cent. on the teas of two and ſix-pence per pound. They now pay ten. And as the teas exported increaſed in prime coſt, this ſhilling gradually decreaſed from forty to ten per cent. on teas between half a crown and ten ſhillings a pound. At preſent with the duty of three-pence, they decreaſe from ten to two and a half per cent. The profits, by evading the payment of the ſhilling, or forty per cent. on thoſe teas which are chiefly demanded in America, as well as the evaſion of the proportion of it in teas of all prices, were an incentive to ſmuggling too ſtrong to be reſiſted; and the contraband in that article being conſequently very great on that account, the export of tea from England to the colonies was vaſtly inferior to the conſumption of it in America. Adminiſtration therefore on the eſtabliſhed and true principles of trade and finance, concluded that three-pence per pound, on all teas, would render the ſmuggling of them ſo little advantageous, that it would be no longer purſued. And conſequently that the ſmall duty, by increaſe

of ſale, would more than compenſate for that of the large that was taken away. The tax therefore is indeed both trifling, and an exoneration. But where is the folly, where the miſchief that has been done by the miniſtry, in thus diminiſhing this tax? how have the miniſtry deliberately thrown away a large duty, which they held in their hands, for the vain hope of getting three fourths leſs? Does it not, as this ſpeaker ſays, ſeem incredible, that he ſhould be ſo definitive and peremptory in the reprehenſion of that which he ſo little underſtands? the miniſtry indeed might eaſily foreſee that the principles which had been propagated by the American advocates in parliament, might create litigation; but could they believe that the colonies would dare to oppoſe a tax on importation, which had been the uſual and undiſturbed practice from the time of king William to the day on which that tax was impoſed? At leaſt they reſolved to reſtore the ſovereign power, which had been abandoned, through every hazard, even to war; *they* have the dignity of their country at heart, and *they* will not timidly yield to the demands of rebellion.

The folly and miſchief imputed to the miniſtry, may now ſeem to be transferred to him that pronounced it, of which a further confirmation will ariſe from the following aſſertion. "The manner of "proceeding in the duties on paper and glaſs, im- "poſed by the ſame act, was exactly in the ſame "ſpirit. There are heavy exciſes on thoſe arti- "cles, when uſed in England. On export, theſe "exciſes are drawn back; but inſtead of with- "holding the draw-back, which might have been "done, without poſſibility of ſmuggling; and "inſtead of applying the money (money already

"in

" in their hands) according to their pleaſure, they
" began their operations in finance, by flinging
" away the revenue; they allowed the whole
" draw-back on export; and then they charged
" the duty (which they had before diſcharged) pay-
" able in the colonies, where it is certain the col-
" lection would devour it to the bone, if any
" revenue were ever ſuffered to be collected.
" One ſpirit pervades and animates the whole
" maſs."

This opinion of our orator in this inſtance is exactly in the ſame ſpirit of commercial knowledge with the preceding. He tells you there are heavy exciſes on paper and glaſs, which on export are drawn back; that theſe might have been withheld with eaſe by the miniſtry, and that they begun with flinging away a revenue in their hands, when he has this moment told you that no ſuch revenue exiſted, the exciſes being drawn back on exportation. However his meaning is that the withholding of heavy exciſes in England, on glaſs and paper, which muſt be paid by the coloniſts in the price of them, is a more judicious mode than laying a ſmall tax on them, to be paid in America. And this he ſays might have been done without a poſſibility of ſmuggling. That the deſire of evading the payment of theſe *heavy exciſes* on the preceding commodities, would naturally excite the practice of contraband, he will hardly deny. But it ſeems ſuch an illicit trade is impoſſible. Yet paper and German glaſs are to be exported from Holland at a much leſs price than they are from England, after the draw-back is allowed. St. Euſtatia and Curaſoe are Dutch iſlands, from whence a variety of merchandiſe is ſmuggled into America. Had the *heavy exciſes* been retained in England, when

theſe commodities were exported to America, would not that aggravation of price have proved to be an incitement to ſmuggling, and have overcome this orator's *impoſſibility*; have thrown open folding-doors to contraband; and inſtead of enabling the miniſtry to keep thoſe exciſes, a revenue in the hands of government, ould it not have annihilated the American ſale of the commodities on which they were aid; and have transferred that money, wh h before came here, into the Dutch dominions? even the ſmall duty, impoſed on theſe commodities, when imported into America, manifeſtly tending to promote a contraband, was one among the commercial motives that induced the preſent miniſtry to repeal thoſe duties. Where now is the folly to be placed? but it appears that this gentleman's ideas of contraband are, that the greater the *profits* of *ſmuggling*, the *leſs* will be the *incitement* to contraband. Is he not always miſtaking the hatchet for the helve, and cutting his fingers by handling what he does not underſtand? *does not one ſpirit pervade and animate his whole maſs?*

" Could any thing, ſays he, be a ſubject of " more juſt alarm to America, than to ſee the " miniſtry go out of the plain high road of fi- " nances, and give up the moſt certain revenues " and the cleareſt intereſts, merely for the ſake of " inſulting the colonies?" but ſuch is the truth that *lowering* the duty on *tea*, and not impoſing duties on things which other nations can more cheaply ſupply, are the certain ways of increaſing a revenue, and the intereſts of a nation. And would it not, on that account, have been going out of the plain road of finance, to have withheld the exciſes which had been conſtantly drawn back

on

on export? and in what manner were the coloniſts inſulted by the exerciſe of that power, of laying duties on American imports, which had been in continual uſage ſince the day on which the Boſtonians received their charter from William the third? even that authority which this gentleman's miniſtry produced a declaratory act to juſtify and eſtabliſh; which *he* adviſed, and on the rectitude of which *he* ſpoke. "No man, ſays he, ever "doubted that the commodity of tea could bear "an impoſition of three-pence." Then why does he *exclaim* againſt the miniſtry who impoſed it? but he adds "no commodity will bear three-pence, "or will bear a penny, when the general feelings "of men are irritated, and two millions of people "are reſolved not to pay." I ſhould imagine, unleſs the commodity had feelings like the people, it might bear it well enough. But I conclude that he means, if two millions of men are irritated, and are reſolved *not* to pay, why then they will not pay. And therefore, as the law directs, and the duty of adminiſtration requires, they muſt be compelled to it by the executive power. For if no taxes were paid, but ſuch as men would be willing to pay, I fancy the government would have but a ſcanty revenue.

"The feelings of the colonies were formerly "the feelings of Great-Britain." It is indiſputably true, that when the colonies were diſtreſſed, Great Britain hath always *felt* for them; witneſs the ſeventy millions ſhe ran in debt to ſupport them in the laſt war; witneſs the numbers of Britons that periſhed in her cauſe; witneſs the ready attention ſhe hath ever paid to all things that might promote their intereſt. But the *feelings* of *Great Britain* have *not* been thoſe of the *colonies*, for with

theſe commodities were exported to America, would not that aggravation of price have proved to be an incitement to ſmuggling, and have overcome this orator's *impoſſibility*; have thrown open folding-doors to contraband; and inſtead of enabling the miniſtry to keep thoſe exciſes, as a revenue in the hands of government, ould it not have annihilated the American ſale of the commodities on which they were aid; and have transferred that money, wh h before came here, into the Dutch dominions? even the ſmall duty, impoſed on theſe commodities, when imported into America, manifeſtly tending to promote a contraband, was one among the commercial motives that induced the preſent miniſtry to repeal thoſe duties. Where now is the folly to be placed? but it appears that this gentleman's ideas of contraband are, that the greater the *profits* of *ſmuggling*, the *leſs* will be the *incitement* to contraband. Is he not always miſtaking the hatchet for the helve, and cutting his fingers by handling what he does not underſtand? *does not one ſpirit pervade and animate his whole maſs?*

" Could any thing, ſays he, be a ſubject of " more juſt alarm to America, than to ſee the " miniſtry go out of the plain high road of fi- " nances, and give up the moſt certain revenues " and the cleareſt intereſts, merely for the ſake of " inſulting the colonies?" but ſuch is the truth that *lowering* the duty on *tea*, and not impoſing duties on things which other nations can more cheaply ſupply, are the certain ways of increaſing a revenue, and the intereſts of a nation. And would it not, on that account, have been going out of the plain road of finance, to have withheld the exciſes which had been conſtantly drawn back

on

on export? and in what manner were the coloniſts inſulted by the exerciſe of that power, of laying duties on American imports, which had been in continual uſage ſince the day on which the Boſtonians received their charter from William the third? even that authority which this gentleman's miniſtry produced a declaratory act to juſtify and eſtabliſh; which *he* adviſed, and on the rectitude of which *he* ſpoke. "No man, ſays he, ever "doubted that the commodity of tea could bear "an impoſition of three-pence." Then why does he *exclaim* againſt the miniſtry who impoſed it? but he adds "no commodity will bear three-pence, "or will bear a penny, when the general feelings "of men are irritated, and two millions of people "are reſolved not to pay." I ſhould imagine, unleſs the commodity had feelings like the people, it might bear it well enough. But I conclude that he means, if two millions of men are irritated, and are reſolved *not* to pay, why then they will not pay. And therefore, as the law directs, and the duty of adminiſtration requires, they muſt be compelled to it by the executive power. For if no taxes were paid, but ſuch as men would be willing to pay, I fancy the government would have but a ſcanty revenue.

"The feelings of the colonies were formerly "the feelings of Great-Britain." It is indiſputably true, that when the colonies were diſtreſſed, Great Britain hath always *felt* for them; witneſs the ſeventy millions ſhe ran in debt to ſupport them in the laſt war; witneſs the numbers of Britons that periſhed in her cauſe; witneſs the ready attention ſhe hath ever paid to all things that might promote their intereſt. But the *feelings* of *Great Britain* have *not* been thoſe of the *colonies*, for with

the immenſe advantages which they acquired by the peace, the traiterous ingrates now refuſe conſtitutionally to contribute to the ſupport of their own governments.

The gentleman having thus exhibited unparalleled proofs how perfectly he is inſtructed in the ſubject of commerce, takes an occaſion to diſplay his knowledge in the hiſtory of his country. "Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. "Hampden, when called upon for the payment of "twenty ſhillings. Would twenty ſhillings have "ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? no! but the "payment of twenty ſhillings, on the principle "it was paid, would have made him a ſlave. It "is the weight of that preamble, of which you "are ſo fond, and not the weight of the duty "that the Americans are unable and unwilling to "bear."

Let me examine into this identity of feelings in Mr. Hampden and the Americans. Charles the firſt and his miniſters, by an exertion of the prerogative royal, commanded his officers to collect the tax of ſhip money. Mr. Hampden inſiſted that the king had no right to raiſe money in that manner; becauſe none but the ſovereign authority of parliament could impoſe a duty on the ſubjects of England. And therefore the proclamation of the king being illegal and arbitrary, he would not comply with that demand.

The parliament of this realm have enacted a tax to be paid by the American ſubjects. Theſe Americans refuſe to obey the law becauſe, as they aver, by the charters of former kings, they are exempted from paying any tax but what they impoſe on themſelves. In Great Britain, none but the parliament can legally levy a tax, and every

exertion

exertion of that kind in a ſovereign is tyranny. In America, none but the king can impart the right of impoſing a duty, and it is tyranny in the legiſlative power of this realm to levy it. Mr. Hampden, in obeying the king's prerogative, would have been a ſlave, and free under a parliamentary taxation in England. The Americans are ſlaves if they obey the parliament, and free under the prerogative royal. Thus the conſtitution of this realm is made to conform to the different inclinations of the ſubjects, as foxes in the moſt northern climates change colour according to the ſeaſons. For if the king, by charter, can grant the right of impoſing taxes, to his American ſubjects, and thereby free them from the obligation of being obedient to the acts of the Britiſh legiſlature, then is he ſuperior to himſelf and his parliament; and the tax of ſhip money was no illegal demand. For certainly he that can juſtly annihilate the parliamentary power over his ſubjects in America, can raiſe a tax in this kingdom without their conſent. But you all know that a Britiſh ſovereign has no right to tax you by his prerogative; and therefore he can never transfer, by charter, to the Americans, that *right* which he does *not* poſſeſs, *an exemption from being taxed by a Britiſh parliament.* This truth is evinced by every charter that has been granted to the cities and towns of England, and even to the colonies themſelves. Every law they make, repugnant to the laws of England is expreſsly null and void? can they therefore be poſſeſſed of a right to make laws, and not to apply them? does not the ſame power which annihilates ſuch laws, abſolutely pronounce that they can have no right to make them? they have all a right to raiſe on themſelves what money

they

they pleaſe for their own uſe; yet are they nevertheleſs as much obliged to pay the taxes of the ſtate as thoſe who are not incorporated by charters. Such is preciſely the caſe of the colonies and of all other corporations?

What ideas then does our orator entertain of the identity, or even ſimilitude of feelings, between Hampden and the coloniſts? can the ſame feelings ariſe from cauſes ſo irreconcileably contradictory? are the equator and the meridian circles leſs parallel than theſe caſes of Hampden and the coloniſts? what motive could have led him to illuſtrate his ſubject by an inſtance which in every point directly oppoſes what he intended to eſtabliſh? this is indeed "*underpinning with clumſy but-*"*tereſſes a pillar which they overthrow.*" And thus you ſee his ſkill in reaſoning by analogy is equal to his logical induction, and his knowledge of hiſtory to that of commerce. And now you may talk as you will of the mulberry tree, commend me to a bit of ſhillalah.*

However "it is the weight of the preamble, "and not the weight of the duty that the Ame-"ricans are unable and unwilling to bear." They *can bear* the *tax*, but *will not bear* the *weight* of the preamble. This weight conſiſts in the raiſing a revenue in ſupport of the adminiſtration of juſtice, of the civil government, and for defending, protecting, and ſecuring themſelves and their properties. This it ſeems they *can* and ought to bear, and *will not*. This alſo is indeed a new method of defence by bringing proof to the contrary of what he intended. Theſe Americans who trumpet their loyalty ſo loudly in all their rebelli-

ous

* Iriſhman in the *Jubilee*.

ous publications, it ſeems *can* but *will not* contribute to the ſupport of *themſelves*. You and I and all the ſubjects of Great Britain and Ireland are not [illegible]ly to diſcharge the intereſt of ſeventy millions borrowed to ſave them from deſtruction in the laſt war, but to ſupport them for the future without their contributing but what they pleaſe to their own preſervation, both in civil and military departments. *They* are to be exempted from the controul of the legiſlature, and *you* obliged to obey it. *They* are to be *free* from *impoſts*, and *you* to be unremittingly *oppreſſed* for *them*. In fact, they are to be your *maſters*, and you their *ſlaves*. *They* are to wanton in eaſe and voluptuouſneſs, and *you* to labour for the ſupporting of them. Such are the purpoſes which this orator and his confederates are labouring to eſtabliſh. And under the deluſive terms of ſupporting *liberty* in *America*, actually to *enſlave* you in *England*. Will you, deſcended from anceſtors who diſdained to be enthralled by *ſovereigns*, ſubmit to the bondage of *men* generated from thoſe who were either by principle and by practice enemies to your conſtitution; or from *ſuch*, as having forfeited their lives by felony, in this kingdom, were tranſported to the colonies? it cannot be! "It is, ſays he, upon the *principle* "of this meaſure, and nothing elſe, that we are "at iſſue; it is a principle of political expen-"diency." It is indeed the expediency of re-eſtabliſhing the legiſlative authority in America, ſo induſtriouſly concealed from you through his long harangue. "The act of 1767 aſſerts that it "is expedient to raiſe a revenue in America; the "act of 1769, which takes away that revenue, "contradicts the act of 1767, and by ſomething "much ſtronger than words, aſſerts, that it is not

"ex-

" expedient." The former act asserts it is *expedient*, that is *fit*, *proper*, to raise a revenue; the taxes were the means by which it was to be raised. The act of 1769 repeals five of these duties for commercial reasons already assigned. The tax on tea still remains. Now in what sense can the *repeal* of duties *contradict* the *fitness* and *properness* of raising a revenue? the repeal brings no proof, but that the means were improper for the end, and therefore repealed. But the expendiency, the fitness of raising a revenue subsists as much before as after. Is it not expedient, that all artisans should live by their labour, but if by any incident or design, their employment be taken from them, does that event contradict the expediency, the fitness, the properness, that these men should live by their labour? I am apprehensive then that this orator either does not understand the word *expedient*, or that he draws a conclusion which is the reverse of logical induction, like a Welch groom that curries the horse from the *head* to the *tail*, and then wipes him backwards from the *tail* to the *head*.

He comes now to arraign the wisdom of parliament. " It is a reflection upon your wisdom to " persist in a solemn parliamentary declaration of " the expediency of any object, for which, at the " same time you make no provision." Surely the gentleman has not exhibited much wisdom in this assertion. Whilst the Americans are in rebellion, and will submit to no law made in England, can it be a *reflection* on the wisdom of parliament that they make *no* provision, when it is certain, that *none* can be made? is it a *reflection* on their wisdom to persist in the declaration of their *fitness* of an *object* which *ought* to be obtained? if by any means the usual supply of provisions for the city

of London ſhould be withheld by Bakers, Brewers, Butchers, &c. would it be a reflection on the wiſdom of parliament to declare the *expediency* of the ſeveral objects for ſupporting life, becauſe the men above-mentioned would not bring their commodities to market? would not parliament behave, in that caſe, as they do in the preſent, compel thoſe fellows to ſupply the markets; or permit the people to take the proviſions without their conſent? has this *ſpeaker* been ſo converſant in Eccleſiaſtes and the books of Solomon, that he can, with juſtice, ſo confidently reprehend the *wiſdom* of parliament?

He now intreats the Commons to attend with more particular care. "Pray, let not this circumſtance eſcape you; it is very material; that "the preamble of this act, which he wiſhes to "repeal, is not *declaratory of a right*, as ſome "gentlemen ſeem to argue it; it is only a recital "of the *expediency* of a certain exerciſe of a right, "ſuppoſed already to have been aſſerted; an exerciſe they are now contending for by ways and "means, which they confeſs, though they were "obeyed, to be utterly inſufficient for their purpoſe." Can it be material to tell the houſe, that an act, which was *never* intended to be *declaratory*, is *not* that which it was *not* intended to be; becauſe ſome gentlemen *ſeem* to think ſo? This preamble, which he has already declared to contain a revenue, a deſcription of a revenue, a tax of ſophiſtry, pedantry, diſputation, war and rebellion, which muſt be given up, "is now *only* a recital "of an expediency of a certain exerciſe of a right "ſuppoſed already to have been aſſerted." And thus he confeſſes, that this preamble does contain a recital of the expediency of exerciſing

the

the legiſlative authority of this realm. Is it a right *ſuppoſed* to have been aſſerted, when the records of parliament *pronounce* it *has been exerted* from the revolution to that act to which he refers? A right *ſuppoſed*, after *his* maſter had obtained, and *he* had voted for an *act declaratory* of that very right. As to the confeſſion of the commons, or the miniſtry, that if the "ways and means for "which they are contending were obeyed, they "would be utterly inſufficient." As he quotes no ſuch confeſſion, I ſhall ſuſpend my belief. For it has been ſufficiently evinced that this orator is capable of miſtakes. And now for the concluſion from his premiſes, "you are therefore at this "moment in the awkward ſituation of fighting "for a phantom, a quiddity; a thing that wants "not only a ſubſtance, but even a name; for a "thing which is neither abſtract, right, nor pro-"fitable enjoyment." Such is this gentleman's idea of the ſovereign legiſlative power of this kingdom. And now it reſults, that this terrible preamble, which muſt be repealed, becauſe it contained the tea duty, does really contain nothing at all, neither *name* nor *ſubſtance*. I wiſh he had inſtructed the houſe in the manner of repealing *nothing at all*; *the file affords no precedent*. And thus from his own lips it appears that theſe miniſters, who are ſo extremely criminal, in not having repealed this preamble, have *nothing* to repeal; and that this orator hath been haranguing upon *nothing at all* through ſuch a prolix profuſion of verboſity. Thus the matter ſo *material*, the eſcape of which the houſe was prayed not to permit, ends in quips and quiddities, phantoms, and things without name or ſubſtance; and then what need was there of adding, that a *nothing*

was

was neither abſtract, right, nor profitable enjoyment?

"They tell you, ſays he, that your dignity is "tied to it, but he knows not how it happens, "but this dignity is a terrible incumbrance to "you, for it has of late been ever at war with "your intereſt, your equity, and every idea of "your policy. Shew the thing you contend for "to be reaſon; ſhew it to be common ſenſe; "ſhew it to be the means of attaining ſome uſeful "end; and then he is content to allow it what "dignity you pleaſe. But what dignity is derived "from the perſeverance in abſurdity is more than "ever he could diſcern." This challenge I ſhall preſume to anſwer, and to ſhew the thing contended for, to be *reaſon*, *common ſenſe*, and to attain ſome *uſeful end*. Is not the ſupport of the ſovereign authority of this realm an object of dignity? is it not the intereſt of the whole nation that it ſhould be ſupported? Is it not equitable that the Americans ſhould obey this power, and contribute to the ſupplies of money which are requiſite for adminiſtering juſtice and defending themſelves? are theſe things at war with every idea of Britiſh policy? how then is this *dignity* at war with the preceding things? is it not therefore ſhewn that it is both reaſon, common ſenſe, and to the attainment of ſome uſeful end? let him therefore prove that theſe particulars are otherwiſe, or allow them that dignity which they truly deſerve. However, that he cannot diſcern what *dignity* is derived from the perſeverance in abſurdity, I do verily believe; for if he had poſſeſſed that talent, this ſpeech would neither have been ſpoken nor printed.

It muſt be confeſſed, however, that what he wants either in candour and diſcernment, is amply compenſated

penſated by his confidence. For in plain Engliſh, the preceding paſſage expreſſes nothing leſs than, that the commons are a pack of fellows ſo ignorant they know not their *own intereſt*, their *own equity*, nor have they *one idea* of their *own policy*. That they are contending for what has neither *reaſon* nor *common ſenſe*, nor *one uſeful end*, and that their whole conduct is a *perſeverance in abſurdity*. It muſt be remarked that this becoming paſſage was ſpoken of the laſt parliament. Of the preſent, he has not printed his opinion.

He then tells you, that "Mr. Cornwal has ſaid "that this ſubject does not ſtand now as it did "formerly. Oh! certainly not; every hour they "continue on this ill-choſen ground, their diffi-"culties thicken on them; and therefore his con-"cluſion is, remove from a bad poſition as quickly "as you can, the diſgrace and the neceſſity of "yielding, both of them grow upon them every "hour of their delay." This reminds me of the ſon of Æolus, whom his father inſtructed in the ſecret of incloſing the winds in leathern bottles, which he was to ſell to thoſe who might want his commodity. But as he had but little demand for his merchandiſe in the iſland in which he was born, near Great Britain, he travelled to Bætica; in which kingdom wealth abounded, in hopes of ſelling his *wind* for ſubſtantial riches. His method was to perſuade them to reſign their gold, and to rely on their imaginations for being enriched by him. In this perſuaſion he diſtributed a large part of his *wind*. They at length believed; and were thereby deprived of three parts in four of their wealth. Such was the *windy* influence of the ſon of Æolus. Perhaps a ſimilar intention might have engaged our orator to part with his *wind*, in order

to

to delude the parliament and the miniſters from their undertakings, reſpecting America. He is underſtood a delivering the ſubſequent words. Commons and miniſters follow the example which was ſet you by my miniſter, and by my advice; repeal the duty on tea, as the ſtamp-act was abrogated, in obedience to the rebellious demands of the Americans; ſacrifice the rights of parliament; diſhonour the king's dignity; betray the truſt of adminiſtration which is repoſed in you; ſet the Americans in an independency of the legiſlature, and free from taxation; and continue to oppreſs the ſubjects of England by new impoſts on their account. Otherwiſe your difficulties will thicken upon you, your diſgrace and the neceſſity of yielding will grow upon you every hour. But neither the commons nor the miniſtry were otherwiſe moved by his *wind*, than to deride the propoſal. They ſaw the inclination and the ends which urged him to the attempt of bringing *them* to a repetition of the follies above recited. But they diſcerned not the deſire of yielding to the Americans, nor the diſgrace of defending all that dignity which the Rockingham miniſtry ſo timidly reſigned.

He continues, "but will you repeal the act, "ſays Mr. Cornwall, at this inſtant, when Ame-"rica is in open reſiſtance? he thinks he has "driven them into a corner; but thus pent up, "he is content to meet him, becauſe he enters the "liſts ſupported by his old authority, Mr. Corn-"wall's new friends, the miniſtry themſelves." It is indeed an heroic act of chivalry. This oratoric champion, pent up in a corner, ſupported by the miniſtry, Mr. Cornwall's new friends, is content to meet that gentleman, who, if that be

true, has no one to aſſiſt him. You ſhall hear the defence he makes. "Mr. Cornwall remembers "that about five years ago, as great diſturbances, "as the preſent, prevailed in America, on ac- "count of the new taxes. The miniſtry repre- "ſented theſe diſturbances as treaſonable; and "this houſe, thought proper, on that repre- "ſentation, to make a famous addreſs for a re- "vival, and for a new application of a ſtatute of "Henry VIII. The commons beſought the king, "in that well conſidered addreſs, to enquire into "treaſons; and to bring the ſuppoſed traitors "from America to Great Britain for trial. His "majeſty was pleaſed graciouſly to promiſe a "compliance with their requeſt. All the at- "tempts from this ſide of the houſe, to reſiſt "thoſe violences, and to bring about a repeal, "were treated with the utmoſt ſcorn. An ap- "prehenſion of the very conſequences now ſtated "by Mr. Cornwall, was then given for ſhutting "the door againſt all hope of ſuch an alteration. "And ſo ſtrong was the ſpirit for ſupporting the "new taxes, that the ſeſſion concluded with the "following remarkable declaration. After ſtating "the vigorous meaſures which had been purſued, "the ſpeech from the throne proceeds.

"You have aſſured me of your *firm* ſupport in "the *proſecution* of them. Nothing, in my opi- "nion, could be more likely to enable the well- "diſpoſed of my ſubjects, in that part of the "world, effectually to diſcourage and defeat the "deſigns of the factious and ſeditious, than the "hearty concurrence of every part of the legiſ- "lature, *in maintaining the execution of the laws in* "*every part* of my dominions.——After this no "man dreamt that a repeal under this miniſtry

"could

"could take place." From that promiſe of the commons to ſupport his majeſty, and from the king's opinion concerning a hearty concurrence of every branch of the legiſlature *in maintaining the execution of the laws* in every part of his dominions, he argues, as if this ſpeech of the king, and declaration of the commons were to be preclusive of all changes in the laws then ſubſiſting; and thence he concludes that no repeal would be made under the preſent miniſtry. And who but ſuch a dreamer has ever dreamt, that any law has been repealed, that then exiſted? ſome of the duties, for reaſons already juſtified, were taken away by a ſubſequent act. But is the former repealed? is a houſe, that uſed to be inhabited by ſix people, without an inhabitant becauſe one alone remains in it? But if that act be repealed, for what is this dreamer eternally contending?

It is his peculiar excellence to defeat, by a ſubſequent paſſage, what he has advanced in a former. "Five days after this ſpeech, the public "circular letter, a part of which he is going to "read, was written by Lord Hilſborough, ſecre-"tary of ſtate for the colonies. After reciting "the ſubſtance of the king's ſpeech, he goes on "thus:

"I can take upon me to aſſure you, notwith-"ſtanding inſinuations to the contrary, from men "*with factious and ſeditious views*, that his ma-"jeſty's *preſent adminiſtration, have at no time "entertained a deſign to propoſe to parliament, to "lay any further taxes upon America, for the pur-"poſe of raiſing a revenue*; and that it is at pre-"ſent their intention to propoſe, the next ſeſſion "of parliament, to take off the duties upon glaſs, "paper, and colours; upon conſideration of ſuch

" duties *having been laid contrary to the true prin-*
" *ciples of commerce.*"

" Theſe have always been, and *ſtill are*, the " ſentiments of his majeſty's *preſent ſervants*; and " by which their conduct, in *reſpect to America*, *has* " *been governed*; and *his majeſty* relies upon your " prudence and fidelity, for ſuch an explanation of " *his* meaſures, as may tend to remove the pre- " judices which have been excited by the miſre- " preſentations of thoſe who are enemies to the " peace and proſperity of Great-Britain and her " colonies, and to re-eſtabliſh that mutual *con-* " *fidence and affection*, upon which the glory of " the empire depends."——"Here is a canonical " book of miniſterial ſcripture, the general epiſtle to " the Americans;" and you ſhall ſoon be convinced, that, like a true heterodox commentator, he makes it ſpeak what it does not imply.

He firſt aſks, " what does Mr. Cornwall ſay to " it?" What that gentleman ſaid I know not; but of this I am certain, that he could have refuted the many confident aſſertions which this orator pronounces in immediate ſucceſſion. Theſe I will preſume to anſwer. " Here a repeal is *promiſed*, promiſed *without condition*, and while their authority was actually reſiſted." The letter of Lord Hillſborough ſays, " it is at *preſent* the intention of adminiſtration to *propoſe*, the next ſeſſion of parliament, to take off the duties upon glaſs, paper, and colours; upon conſideration of ſuch duties having been laid contrary to the true principles of commerce."

Do theſe words *promiſe* a repeal of an act, which only expreſs the *then* intention of the miniſtry, to *propoſe* to parliament the taking away the duties on glaſs, paper, and colours? Can that be a *re-*

peal

peal of an act which leaves it in full energy, reſpecting the tax on tea? Can it be a repeal *without condition*; when the *condition* is, that the tax on tea ſhall continue? Where then is this promiſe, without *condition?* "*I paſs by* the pub-"lic promiſe of a peer, relative to the repeal of "taxes by this houſe. I paſs by," ſays he, "the "uſe of the king's name in a matter of ſupply, "that ſacred and reſerved right of the commons." Is his majeſty's name applied in a matter of ſupply, when it is expreſsly ſaid, "his majeſty relies "on the prudence and fidelity of the American "governors, for ſuch an explanation of meaſures "as may tend to remove the prejudices which "have been excited by the miſrepreſentation of "thoſe who are enemies to their country." Where then is this *promiſe* of a *peer*, relative to the repeal of taxes? Where is the *king's name* uſed in a matter of *ſupply?* But things impoſſible to other men, by him are eaſily effected. He can *hear* things that *no* longer *ſound*; and, therefore, he can as readily *paſs by* what *never* did exiſt. But truth will ſting, though not reclaim, an evil conſcience. He felt for thoſe to whom theſe miſrepreſentations of the *enemies* of Great-Britain and her colonies were directed. *Vengeance* beholds the ſtraight line of *verity*, through a medium like an ill made pane of glaſs, by which it is diſtorted from its true direction into a variety of deviations." "I conceal," ſays he, "the ridiculous figure of parliament, "hurling its thunders at the gigantic rebellion of "America; and then, five days after, proſtrate at "the feet of thoſe aſſemblies they affected to de-"ſpiſe, begging them, by the intervention of "their miniſterial ſureties, to receive ſubmiſſion, "and heartily promiſing amendment." But where

are all theſe diſgraceful deeds of parliament to be found? By what means can a letter from Lord Hillſborough proſtrate the parliament at the feet of the American aſſemblies? was he ordered by parliament to write that letter? Wherein conſiſts the ridiculous figure which parliament hath made by hurling thunders at the gigantic rebellion of America, are they not continued and encreaſed? But in what part of this letter are to be ſeen this proſtration, this begging the aſſemblies to receive ſubmiſſion, and this hearty promiſe of amendment, in oppoſition to the inſinuations of factious ſeditious men? It is indeed ſaid, the *preſent* adminiſtration have not deſigned to propoſe any farther taxes on America, for *raiſing a revenue*; is that a ſubmiſſion? Is it a proſtration to oppoſe the malice of men who intend to ſubvert their country's rights? Is it a proſtration to take off duties which were contrary to the true principles of commerce? and that ſuch they were, I have ſhewn to demonſtration. Is it *begging*, to ſay his majeſty relies on his governors for a refutation of the falſhoods which have been promulged by the enemies both of Britain and her colonies? Where then is this ridiculous figure to be found, even in the miniſter who wrote this letter? But although no ſuch ignominious proceedings be therein to be diſcerned, you ſhall ſpeedily be ſhewn by whom this proſtration, this begging, this hearty promiſe of amendment were made, to the indelible diſgrace of themſelves; and by the impious oblation of the rights of Britain to the ſhrine of rebellion in America. Is not this opprobrious repreſentation of the Britiſh parliament, ſomething more than ridiculous in Edmund Burke, Eſq?

" Paſſing

" Paſſing therefore," ſays he, " from the con-
" ſtitutional conſideration to the mere policy, does
" not this letter imply, that the *idea* of taxing
" America, for the purpoſe of a revenue, is an
" abominable project ; when the miniſtry ſuppoſe
" none but factious men, and with ſeditious views,
" could charge them with it ?" Is it a conſequence that this letter muſt imply, that the idea of taxing America, is an abominable project, becauſe the miniſtry ſuppoſe that none but *factious* men would charge them with it ? If none but *virtuous men*, and *good ſubjects*, had thus accuſed them, it might have been ſuppoſed to be an *abominable project*. But the charges of *faction*, which are founded on the principles of *malevolence*, for intereſted ends, were never deemed, till now, to indicate, that the objects which were reprobated, were therefore abominable. This orator enquires into the weight of all things, as a tanner does into that of an ox's hide, by dragging it backwards by the tail.

He continues, " does not this letter adopt and
" ſanctify the American diſtinction, of *taxing for*
" *a revenue.*" And what if it does, wherein conſiſts the criminality ? " Does it not formally reject
" all *future* taxation on that principle ?" No ! the letter expreſsly declares, that his majeſty's *preſent adminiſtration*, do not intend to propoſe to parliament the laying of any *further* tax for a revenue. And that it is their *preſent intention* to propoſe the next ſeſſion to take off the duties on glaſs, &c. leaving that on tea.

Do *preſent* intentions *formally reject* all *future* deſigns of taxation for a revenue ? But he confounds all *times* and all ideas *preſent* and *future* ; *parts* and the *whole*, have no diſtinctions in his conception. " Does it not," he adds, " ſtate the

" miniſterial rejection of ſuch principle of taxa-
" tion, not as the occaſional, but the conſtant,
" opinion of the king's ſervants." It ſtates no *re-jection* at all. It ſtates only, that it was *then* the *intention* of the miniſtry to lay no *further* taxes upon the Americans; and that it was their *then* intention, to propoſe taking off the duties on glaſs, &c. Where is the *principle* of taxation rejected; when the tax on tea is continued? how do theſe words ſignify a *conſtant* opinion, and not an *occaſional*, which expreſs it to be the opinion of *that time*, and on *that occaſion*.

He perſiſts, " does it not ſay (I care not how
" conſiſtently,) but does it not ſay, that their con-
" duct, with regard to America, has been *always*
" governed by this policy?" That this ſpeaker has no *care* for conſiſtency, has been evinced beyond diſpute. Otherwiſe, how could he have aſked this queſtion? for what is there that can prove, that the conduct of the *preſent* miniſtry, has not been governed by that policy? Were not theſe duties impoſed by the *preceding* miniſtry? have not five of them been repealed by the *preſent*; does not this prove, to demonſtration, that this conduct of not taxing for a revenue, is that which has governed the policy of the preſent miniſters?

" It goes further. Theſe excellent and truſty
" ſervants of the king, juſtly fearful leſt they
" themſelves ſhould have loſt all credit with the
" world, bring out the image of their gracious
" ſovereign from the inmoſt and moſt ſacred ſhrine,
" and they pawn him, as a ſecurity for their pro-
" miſe. *His majeſty relies on the prudence and*
" *fidelity of the commons*," *whereas it was on that of the governors, for ſuch an explanation of his meaſures.*

Thus,

Thus, with as much good manners as truth, he repreſents the miniſtry as a ſet of Popiſh prieſts, who having brought forth his majeſty, as an image in a proceſſion from the inmoſt ſhrine, turn thieves and pledge it to the commons as a ſet of pawnbrokers. But not a ſyllable of all this confident aſſertion is to be found in the letter. It has been already proved, that it contains nothing of all that he has aſſerted. Can his majeſty be pledged for that which is *not* in the letter? the king relies on the governours of the provinces to explain his meaſures, to obviate the miſrepreſentations of his and the nation's enemies. Is he thereby pledged as a ſecurity for promiſes? promiſes which you are convinced have no exiſtence? If the world does entertain the leaſt regard for juſtice and for truth, the miniſters will preſerve their credit, and this orator become the univerſal contempt and outcaſt of every true Briton.

The conduct of lord Bottetourt in Virginia, being conſentaneous with lord Hillſborough's letter, that which juſtifies the latter exculpates his lordſhip. I ſhall therefore only obſerve that this orator, ſo over ſcrupulouſly delicate, at the end of what he tranſcribes from lord Bottetourt's ſpeech to the Virginians, has marked the ſubſequent words, by printing them in a different letter from the reſt. "*That his majeſty would rather* " *part with his crown, than preſerve it by deceit.*" The paſſage immediately ſucceeding will probably explain the reaſon of this diſtinction.

" A glorious and true character, which (ſince " the commons ſuffer his miniſters with impunity " to anſwer for his ideas of taxation) they ought " to make it their buſineſs to enable his majeſty " to preſerve it in all its luſtre. Let him have

" character,

" character, ſince ours is no more. Let ſome part " of the government be kept in reſpect."

As no man that does, or ever did exiſt, has a more juſt claim, from invariable practice, to draw concluſions, which his premiſes will *not* ſupport, I will generouſly allow it him in this inſtance. The plain meaning of the preceding words is this. Since his majeſty's *ideas* of taxation are ſuch as the miniſters ought to be *puniſhed* for carrying into execution : and ſince the parliament cannot puniſh theſe *iniquitous ſervants*, they ought to enable their *maſter*, the *contriver* of this *criminal* taxation, to preſerve his *character* in all its luſtre. If the orator chuſes to accept this explanation of the preceding paſſage, he ſtands only as the moſt abſurd of all reaſoners. But I imagine from the diſtinctive manner in which theſe words are printed, " *he* " *would rather part with his crown, than preſerve it* " *by deceit*," that the preceding paſſage was ironically intended. And this I ſurmiſe, as much from the diſpoſition to malevolence which appears in this ſpeech, as from the difference in the printing. For ſuch is the irony of this ſpeaker, it conveys no hint either of wit or humour, and always requires italics as an indication of his intention, the circumſtance of malevolence excepted. If it be irony, he then eſcapes the imputation of abſurdity in falſe reaſoning in this inſtance, and only charges his ſovereign with the character of *deceitful*, which is to be preſerved in all its *luſtre*. He will never decide this matter; to you I leave whether it is to be imputed to his *head* or to his *heart*.

Such are the comments of this curious commentator; and now their merit and intent are truly expoſed, I will not injure your good ſenſe. I will not even ſuggeſt that Britons can remain without conviction of his heterodoxy, and that the ge-

general

neral epiſtle to the Americans is a *canonical* book of miniſterial ſcripture. "*What does the gentle-*
"*man ſay to that?*"

He then tells you it was the letter of lord North and of all the king's then miniſters. If they have as much reaſon to be aſhamed of that letter, as he has of his comments, they muſt each of them be endued with more impudence than falls to the ſhare of one man in a million, ſhould either of them dare to ſpeak again in parliament. He then tells you, that "the very firſt news that "a Britiſh parliament heard what it was to do "with the duties which it had granted to the king, "was by the publication of the votes of Ame-"rican aſſemblies. It was in America that your "reſolutions were pre-declared. It was from "thence that we knew to a certainty how much "exactly, and not a ſcruple more or leſs, we were "to repeal. We were unworthy to be let into the "ſecret of our own conduct."

The letter ſays it was the preſent intention of the miniſtry to propoſe, in the *next* ſeſſion of parliament, to take off the duties upon glaſs, &c. As the parliament was prorogued before the writing of the preceding letter to the American governours, what reaſon was there that the parliament ſhould be acquainted before the prorogation, with what was intended to be propoſed to them in the next ſeſſion? and that a ſet of men can be let into the *ſecret* of their *own* conduct, ſeems to be a conception as abſurd as that of the perſon who hung a glaſs at his bed's foot to ſee how he *looked* when he was *faſt aſleep*.

"Do you after this, ſays he, wonder that you "have no weight and no reſpect in the colonies. "After this are you ſurpriſed that parliament is

"every

" every day and every where loſing (I feel it with
" ſorrow, I utter it with reluctance) that reveren-
" tial affection which ſo endearing a name of au-
" thority ought to carry with it; that you are
" obeyed ſolely with reſpect to the bayonet;
" and that this houſe, the ground and pillar of
" freedom, is itſelf held up by the treacherous
" underpinning and clumſy butttereſſes of arbi-
" trary power."

Is it not ſomewhat ſingular that an orator, who is ſuppoſed equally to underſtand every thing to which he preſumes, ſhould reprehend the conduct of miniſters for not preparing the members, when the parliament was not ſitting, for what they were to do when they did aſſemble? and that this parliament ſhould loſe their reverential affection, becauſe they were *not* treated contrary to the dictates of this conſtitution, by which they are enjoined to enter the houſe unprepoſſeſſed and unprejudiced? if the houſe hath loſt its endearing name of authority, to whom is it to be aſcribed but to this ſpeaker and his aſſociates, who have filled the minds of the populace and the Americans with ſuch reſolutions to rebellion, as nothing but the bayonet can ſubdue? oh! but the metaphor! the beauty and preſervation of the metaphor! The *houſe* is the *ground* on which it ſtands, it is the *pillar* that ſtands on *that* again, and is *itſelf* held up only by the treacherous *underpinning* clumſy *butttereſſes* of *arbitrary power*. And thus this houſe of *freedom* is held up, in this kingdom, by *that* which has conſtantly *overſet* it in all the other nations of the earth, by the butttereſſes of *treachery* and *arbitrary power*.* Happy Britons,

* Bathos. chap. 5. Of the true genius for the profund, and by what it is conſtituted. He is to mingle bits of the moſt various

tons, you have nought to fear? for, according to the ideas and the words of this profound orator, your liberty can never fail! even arbitrary power props your freedom. If I could ſuppoſe him ignorant in *any thing*, from this paſſage I ſhould think it muſt be in architecture, from whence he has taken the preceding images. The imaginations of other men have frequently tranſgreſſed the laws of nature, and combined the parts of animals that never did exiſt together. They have made griffins, flying-horſes, centaurs, and mermaids. Theſe the pencil may delineate, and fancy conceive the poſſibility of their exiſtence. But this gentleman's genius deſpiſes ſuch tame invention. He overleaps the bounds of *poſſibility*; combines ſuch things as never can exiſt together; and reſolutely dives into the *profund* beyond thoſe depths to which the moſt daring mortal hath ever penetrated. Many of our orators have done gloriouſly, but Burke hath excelled them all!

He advances with equal judgement and rapidity. "If this dignity, which is to ſtand in the "place of juſt policy and common ſenſe, had "been conſulted, there was a time for preſerving "it, and for reconciling it with any conceſſion." Of what can that *dignity* conſiſt, which is to ſtand in the place of *juſt policy* and *common ſenſe?* ſhould the preſervation of ſuch a *dignity* be ever conſulted? can the time have ever arrived for reconciling it with any *conceſſion* but that of *folly?* it is the *peculiar* idea of this gentleman, reſpecting *dignity*, that

---

various or diſcordant kind, as it ſhall beſt pleaſe his imagination, and contribute to his principal end, which is to glare by ſtrong oppoſition of colours, *and ſurpriſe by contrariety of images.*

that it can be reconcileable with *bad* policy and *folly*.

But he is ſo benignant, he will tell you *how* and *when* this wonderful reconciliation might have been accompliſhed, " *if* in the ſeſſion of 1768, " that " ſeſſion of idle terror and empty menaces, the " houſe had, as they were often preſſed to do, re- " pealed the taxes; then their ſtrong operations " would have come juſtified and enforced, in " caſe their conceſſions had been returned by out- " rages." He has told you the preamble was a phantom, a quiddity, a thing without ſubſtance or even a name; therefore, a *nothing*. Is *that* to be repealed? He has told you *alſo* the act *was* repealed. And now he ſays, *if* the parliament *had* repealed this act, and that conceſſion had been returned with outrage, why then their ſtrong operations would have come juſtified and enforced. If this would have preſerved the *dignity* of parliament, it muſt indeed have ſtood in the place of juſt policy and common-ſenſe. But how could it have reconciled this *dignity* with this *conceſſion*? Can the dignity of a ſtate be preſerved by ſurrendering its authority? and really the imagination, that the Americans would have returned outrages for the conceſſion of what they required; a conceſſion that would in fact have given up the parliamentary right of taxing them, is not a little extraordinary. If they did not, what cauſe could the parliament have had for enforcing? Does it not ſeem, as if he were convinced that theſe republican fanatics would *not* have accepted of any advantage that is *not* obtained by *rebellion?* and therefore, that ſuch ſtrong operations would have been neceſſary?

" The

" The commons," as he declares, " began with " violence; and before terrors could have any " effect, good or bad, the miniſters immediately " begged pardon, and promiſed that repeal to " the Americans, which they had refuſed to an " eaſy, good-natured, complying Britiſh parlia- " ment." As to the begging pardon, and promiſed repeal, thoſe circumſtances are diſpatched. But how will this orator reconcile that the ſame parliament, which pronounced terror and menaces to the Americans, becauſe they would not comply with the taxes, ſhould be an eaſy, good-natured, complying parliament that requeſted this repeal? or if they inclined to the repeal; what could have prevented them from paſſing it?

Diſorder in variety we ſee,
And here, as all things differ, none agree.

" The aſſemblies which had been publicly and " avowedly diſſolved, for *their* contumacy, are " called together to receive the parliament's ſub- " miſſion." Enough has been ſaid on that ſubmiſſion. " The miniſterial directors bluſtered like " magic tyrants here; and then went mumping " with a ſore leg in America, canting, and " whining, and complaining of faction, which re- " preſented them as friends to a revenue from the colonies." Had *all* the miniſterially directing mumpers, but *one* ſore leg among them? Did they take *it* by *turns* through the provinces, or how did they manage it? but I will ſoon ſhew who were in reality the miniſterially directing *mumpers*, and reſtore the *ſore leg* to that *body* to which it alone belongs.

" I hope," ſays he, " no body in this houſe " will hereafter have the *impudence* to defend

" American

" American taxes in the name of miniſtry." I alſo ſhould have *my* hope, if any good were to be expected from this orator, that he would never more have the *impudence* to calumniate the miniſtry on the ſubject of American taxes. " The " moment they do," ſays he, " with this letter of " attorney in his hand, he will tell them, in th- " authoriſed terms, they are wretches *with factious* " *and ſeditious views*; *enemies to the peace and pro-* " *ſperity of the mother country and the colonies*, and " ſubverters *of the mentual affection and confidence* " *on which the glory and ſafety of the Britiſh empire* " *depend.*" Will thoſe words, derived from the conduct of him and his confederates, authoriſe him to pronounce them againſt thoſe who ſhall defend the miniſtry in tranſactions ſo juſt and defenſible? No! he will not attempt it. He will never more produce that paper which is now ſo fully proved to falſify his aſſertions. Even he, this orator, will be too ſcrupulouſly delicate to produce, a ſecond time, a plenary refutation of all he has compelled that paper to imply.

" After this letter," he adds, " the queſtion is " no more on propriety or dignity; they are gone " already. The faith of your ſovereign is pledged " to the political principle. The general declara- " tion in the letter goes to the whole of it." The falſity of all this hath been already evinced; it will be endleſs to anſwer a tedious repetition of the ſame miſtakes. But mind the dictatorial ſpirit of this Edmund Burke, Eſq; once private ſecretary to Lord Rockingham, to the commons of this realm, " you muſt," ſays he, " therefore either " abandon the ſcheme of taxing, or you muſt ſend " the miniſters tarred and feathered to America, " who dared to hold out the royal faith for a re-

" nunciation

" nunciation of all taxes for revenue. Them you " muſt puniſh, or this faith you muſt preſerve." That no ſuch faith, for a renunciation of ſuch taxes, was ever held out, has been already proved to demonſtration. Appeal to the letter of Lord Hillſborough. Again be ſatisfied. There was a time when the commons of Britain would not have borne ſo dictatorial an inſult, founded on the miſrepreſentation and calumny of their own tranſactions. In thoſe days, had he uttered ſuch atrocious terms, he would himſelf have been metaphorically tarred, and *papered* with his ſpeech; and ſent whereever he pleaſed to go, except into that houſe. But another puniſhment awaits him. His *oration* commits ſelf-murder. On this inqueſt it will be buried in a croſs-way, and a ſtake driven through it, as a warning to all future ſpeakers, not to rely on *ſound* without *ſenſe*.

" This preſervation of the royal faith," he adds, " is of more conſequence than the duties on *red* " *lead* or *white lead*, or on broken *glaſs*, or *atlas*, " *ordinary*, or *demi fine*, or *blue royal*, or *baſtard*, " or *fool's-cap*, which they have given up, or the " three-pence on tea, which they retained." And I will add, of more conſequence than all the *fools*, who pretending to be ſpeakers, are eternally evincing their want of intellect. But reflect, I intreat you, with what propriety this opinion, of the preſervation of the royal faith, iſſues from the lips of him, who, with his maſter, gave up the royal *faith* which had been pledged, in the miniſtry of Mr. Grenville, to ſupport the parliament in their reſolves to ſuſtain his majeſty againſt the revolt of the Americans. This how ſhamefully they gave up, ſhall be proved when I come to examine the Rockingham adminiſtration.

From what motives do theſe eternal and ſelf-contradictory aſſertions ſpring? Is it from inability to comprehend the plain expreſſions of Lord Hillſborough's letter? is it from an incapacity to draw juſt concluſions from his own promiſes? Does he imagine, that he can hold the underſtandings of mankind within a circle that they cannot paſs, as conjurors are ſaid to treat the devil? Is it from revenge, from deſperation, from *invidiouſneſs?* Aye, *that is the cauſe that makes this ſpeech of ſo long breath.* "The miniſtry which is here ſhining in "riches, in favour, and in power, and urging the "puniſhment of that very offence to which this "orator and his aſſociates had been the temp-"ters."

He continues, "If reaſons, reſpecting ſimply "your own commerce, which is your own con-"venience, were the ſole grounds of the repealing "of the five duties, why does Lord Hillſborough, "in diſclaiming in the name of the king and mi-"niſters, their ever having had an intent to tax "for revenue, mention it as the means of re-eſta-"bliſhing the confidence and affection of the co-"lonies?" But wherein hath his lordſhip *diſclaimed*, in the name of the king and miniſters, their *ever* having had an intent to tax for revenue? his letter expreſsly declares the contrary; that the preſent adminiſtration have no deſign to lay any *farther* taxes upon America for a revenue. The term *farther* abſolutely implies, as the fact does verify, that they were *already* laid for that end. How then will he explain, that what has *never been ſaid* can have been *mentioned*, as the means of re-eſtabliſhing the confidence of the colonies? I will preſume once to anſwer for him. By confounding, in his uſual manner, times paſt with times to come,

and

and things that never did exiſt with aſſertions that they have exiſted.

" Is it a way of ſoothing *others*, ſays he, " to " aſſure them that you will take good care of " yourſelf ?" It is indeed a very miſtaken way. But where does he find it ? Not in Lord Hillſborough's letter ; for therein it is ſaid, that his lordſhip " will be content to be declared infamous, if " he does not, to the laſt hour of his life, exert " every power, in order to obtain and maintain, " for the continent of America, that ſatisfaction " which he has been authoriſed to promiſe." Has it been violated ? Do theſe expreſſions aſſure the Americans, that *he* will take good *care* of *himſelf*, which promiſe that *care* of *them ?*

" The medium, the only medium, for regain- " ing the American affection and confidence, is, " that you will take off ſomething oppreſſive to " their minds." Have you ever heard till now of a medium *for* regaining affection ? is the *will* of taking ſomething from their minds a *medium* ? However, to underſtand what his words do not expreſs, and yet as he meant them, let me aſk you if he be not a man to whom experience has *not* taught wiſdom ? or could he, who adviſed, harangued and voted, for the repeal of the ſtamp act, have ſaid, that the removal of oppreſſion will regain confidence in America ? If what is oppreſſive to the minds of men be a reaſon for removing it, what law can then remain unabrogated ? Will not the murderer, the felon, the cheat, the impoſtor, and every ſpecies of villains, revolt againſt the parliamentary authority until the ſtatutes, which oppreſs their minds, be taken off ? The blind ſee nothing. They know their condition, and feel their way with a ſtick. If this orator

would follow their example, he would not ſo conſtantly *run againſt* the *facts* which *ſtand* in his *way*.

He ſays, " the letter ſtrongly enforces the idea, " of eaſing their minds by taking away *all* taxes," and yet that letter does abſolutely leave the tea tax unrepealed.

He perſiſts, " for though the repeal of the taxes " be promiſed on commercial principles, yet the " means of counteracting *the inſinuations of men with* " *ſeditious and factious views*, is by a diſclaimer of " the intention of taxing for revenue, as a con- " ſtant invariable ſentiment, and rule of conduct " in the government of America." There is ſomething, to my comprehenſion, not a little ænigmatical in this paſſage. The *repeal* of the taxes is promiſed on commercial principles : yet the *means* of counteracting the inſinuations of men with factious and ſeditious views, is *by* a diſclaimer of the intention of taxing for revenue, as a conſtant invariable ſentiment, and rule of conduct in the government of America. But there exiſts no diſclaimer, as it has been already proved; and thus the *means* conſiſt in that which has *no* exiſtence.

" I remember," ſays he, " Lord North, *not in* " *a former debate, to be fair*, (it would be diſor- " derly to refer to it, I ſuppoſe I read it ſome- " where,) but the noble lord was pleaſed to ſay, " that he did not conceive how it could enter into " the head of man, to impoſe thoſe taxes which " he voted for impoſing, and voted for repeal- " ing ; as being taxes contrary to all the princi- " ples of commerce, laid on *Britiſh manufactures*." Oh! what a namby pamby attempt to wit or humour do, *his to be ſure, and his ſuppoſe he read it ſomewhere*, exhibit.

This

This he adduces as an inſtance of his lordſhip's inconſiſtency and ſelf-contradiction. But I will prove that it is conſiſtent in every part, and conſentaneous with the ſtricteſt integrity. When theſe taxes were laid, his lordſhip was not a miniſter. He knew *then* what he ſince expreſſed as above. His motive for voting them was the reinſtating of the parliamentary authority. The taxes were eſtimated as a ſecondary conſideration. He knew that every day's delay encreaſed the danger of annihilating the former, and therefore that it was not to be poſtponed. He knew the latter might be repealed on ſome ſubſequent occaſion. Such were then his views. Since the time he has been miniſter, he has verified his opinion, by an actual repeal of thoſe taxes on Britiſh manufactures; and he has preſerved the duty on tea for the ſake of ſuſtaining the ſovereign authority, which was his original and ſole motive. Hence it appears, that voting at firſt for the impoſition, and ſubſequently for the repeal, are neither inconſiſtency nor contradiction in his lordſhip's conduct. Painters, who wiſh to draw juſtly, practiſe the cuſtom of placing their portraits before a glaſs, and examining them in the reflected image. By theſe means, a number of errors are remarked and corrected, which had otherwiſe eſcaped. It would be well judged in this orator, if he would imitate that cuſtom; and conſider his ſpeeches in the reflexion of a better judgement than his own, before he printed them *at leaſt*. It is true indeed the ſufferings of vanity might be ſo grievous, by theſe means, that probably an orator for rebellion would be loſt. But the commons would receive the vaſt advantage of being freed from ſo much ſenſeleſs ſound and ſelf-contradiction.

He grows audacious. " He *dares* ſay the noble " lord is perfectly well read, becauſe the duty of " his particular office requires he ſhould be ſo, in " all our revenue laws, and in the policy which is " to be collected out of them." From the peculiar kind of politeneſs which he has ſhewn this nobleman, throughout his ſpeech, I ſugge this to be intended for irony. I could wiſh in ſuch inſtances of attempting to be *humourous* or *witty*, he would follow the example of a ſign painter, who could draw but one thing, which was the white roſe. In conſequence of his *genius* being tethered to that alone, he kept a number of ſigns ready painted, and then wrote under the white roſe, by way of note, this is the ſign of the *black* dog, or the *red lion*; as his chapman choſe his ſign ſhould be. A note for the future, *this is irony*, this is *wit*, or this is *humour*, under the paſſages which he intends to paſs for ſuch, would be a very convenient indication to his readers. But let me ſeriouſly aſk this confident ſpeaker, whether it be not the *duty* of *one*, who arraigns the conduct of *others*, to be *perfectly well read* in the ſubject on which he ſpeaks? hath he obſerved that rule in this ſpeech?

" Now, ſays he, when his lordſhip had read " this act of American revenue, and a little re- " covered from his aſtoniſhment, I ſuppoſe he " made *one* ſtep *retrograde* (it is but *one*) and look- " ed at the act which ſtands juſt *before* it in the " ſtatute book." What could be the cauſe of his lordſhip's aſtoniſhment at reading an act with which he had been well acquainted, during its paſſing through the houſe, ſeems difficult to be conceived by a common underſtanding. But is there not ſomething as truly aſtoniſhing in this orator's penetration. He has diſcovered that *one* ſtep

ſtep *retrograde* is but *one*; and that his lordſhip made this ſtep *backwards*, to look at ſomething that ſtood *before* his laſt object. He then tells you "of the duties laid on the commodities imported "into the iſle of Man, that the two acts perfectly "agree in all reſpects except one, which is, that "the duties are a great deal higher on the things "imported into the iſle, than into the continent "of America. And that both acts were exactly "the ſame for raiſing revenues. He then aſks, "will the noble lord condeſcend to tell him why "he repealed the taxes on your manufactures ſent "out to America, and not the taxes on the ma-"nufactures exported to the iſle of Man? the "principle was exactly the ſame, the objects "charged infinitely more extenſive, the duties "without compariſon higher. Why." He *aſks* his lordſhip, and anſwers *himſelf*. "Why not-"withſtanding all his childiſh pretexts, becauſe "the taxes were quickly ſubmitted to in the iſle "of Man, and becauſe they raiſed a flame in "America, their reaſons were political not com-"mercial."

I have already repeatedly ſhewn you that the principle of the American act was to re-eſtabliſh the ſupreme legiſlature of this realm; and that the taxes were the means of doing it. The act relative to the iſle of Man had no ſuch motive, it was ſolely for raiſing a revenue. Your orator, however, who is conſtantly engaged in ſetting things up for the ſake of overthrowing them himſelf, as *chilaren* build houſes with cards, is on this occaſion, as is cuſtomary, kind enough to refute what his queſtion propoſes. "It was becauſe the taxes were *quietly* "ſubmitted to in the iſle of Man, and becauſe "they raiſed a *flame* in America." Did he expect

the noble lord would repeal thoſe taxes which the Manckſmen quietly received? and when the flame which was raiſed, had heated the Americans to a degree of not receiving the Britiſh manufactures, whilſt the duties were on them, did there not ariſe a juſt cauſe for repealing thoſe duties, that the manufacturers might not be leſs employed in England? and thus thoſe two things which are *exactly the ſame* are *totally diſſimilar*. I preſume the reaſons of lord North for repealing five of the American taxes were both *political* and *commercial*. That they were commercial I have ſufficiently ſhewn, and by what magic this ſpeaker can divide *commerce* from *policy* in this inſtance, *he* muſt explain; or *you* yourſelves diſcover; it exceeds my comprehenſion.

He then returns, like a miſer's ghoſt to his hidden treaſure, and aſſerts "the repeal was made as "lord Hillſborough's letter well expreſſes it, to "acquire *the confidence and affection of the colonies*, "*on which the glory and ſafety of the Britiſh empire* "*depends.*" The letter expreſsly pronounces that the taxes were repealed on *the true principles of commerce*; and that the glory and ſafety of the Britiſh empire depended on effacing the miſrepreſentations of the *enemies* of her empire. Even this orator, in the preceding page, declares that the letter ſays, "*the repeal of the taxes was promiſed on commercial* "*principles.*" Will he neither believe himſelf nor the letter? how then can he expect that the world will give credit to what he avers?

However, let it be imagined that the duties have been repealed for the reaſons which he aſcribes to lord Hillſborough. "That, he ſays, was "a wiſe and juſt motive ſurely, if ever there was "ſuch. But the miſchief and the diſhonour is, "that

" that they have not done what they had given " the colonies juſt cauſe to expect, when the mi- " niſters diſclaimed the taxing for a revenue." Hence it appears that the repeal, which he ſays was *made* on a wiſe and juſt motive, was not *made* at all; becauſe the miſchief and diſhonour *is*, that the miniſters have *not* done what they had given the colonies juſt reaſon to expect, when they diſclaimed the idea of taxing for a revenue. And thus this miſchief, this diſhonour aroſe from *not* having *done* that which they had *done* by the repeal; or from diſregarding the *promiſe* of a *diſclaimer* which, it has been incontrovertibly proved, they *never* did *promiſe*.

In fact, this orator's potatoe bed of fallacy, abſurdity, and ſelf-contradiction, is ſo extremely prolific: they ſhoot from one another in ſuch amazing numbers, that no labour, no induſtry, no art, can clear the ground of their ſuper-abundance.

And now for a rant of *exclamation* moſt over ſcrupulouſly delicate, " there is nothing ſimple, " nothing manly, nothing ingenuous, open, de- " ciſive, or ſteady, in the proceeding with regard " either to the continuance or repeal of the taxes. " The whole has an air of littleneſs and fraud." It is a painful taſk ſo conſtantly to return to the refuting of what has been already ſo repeatedly diſproved. Yet ſuch is the confidence of this ſpeaker and his aſſociates, that if a ſingle circum-ſtance, although it be exactly ſimilar to what has been already refuted, be left unanſwered, they will unanimouſly pronounce, it is unanſwerable. I therefore intreat your patience in the prolixity of this reply. And although I may with ſafety refer you to the narrative already given of miniſterial

conduct

conduct in this affair, yet to preclude every means of his eluding a defeat, I will examine this exploſion of verboſity.

The ſimpleneſs of every undertaking conſiſts in its being compounded of as few objects as poſſible. In this inſtance, it conſiſts of two alone; thoſe of reſtoring the ſupreme authority to exertion and vigour in America, and of impoſing a tax as the means of obtaining that end. Thus the *end* and the *means* conſtitute but *two*. Can he conceive an undertaking in which there are neither means nor object? is he ſo ſkilled in any art, that he can ſo ſimplify *two* things as to make them leſs than *two*? where then is the want of its being *ſimple*. Wherein conſiſts the defect of manlineſs? the act indeed impoſed taxes, on ſeveral commodities, in a former adminiſtration, which lord North then diſliked. They were repealed, ſince he was miniſter, for commercial reaſons. But the duty on tea does ſtill preſerve that act in as much energy as before: and the means which are now employing evince that it is ſupported by manlineſs. But that Edmund Burke, who adviſed, harangued, and voted for the puſillanimous retreat of his maſter before rebellion, without riſking an engagement, ſhould charge the miniſtry with unmanlineſs, is an act of confidence not eaſily to be equalled. And as nonſenſe can never be more juſtly applied than to him, it may be ſaid, *none but himſelf can be his parallel.*

Return to lord Hillſborough's letter, you will there be convinced that nothing can be more ingenuous, open, deciſive, or ſteady, in the proceeding, with regard either to the continuance or the repeal of the taxes. You are therein told that the five duties are only intended to be repealed; that it was the preſent intention of the miniſter

to

to lay no more taxes for a revenue; that his lordſhip pledged his honour for the truth of theſe things. All theſe particulars have been moſt religiouſly obſerved. From whence then does this charge ariſe, of diſingenuous concealment, indeciſion, verſatility, with regard either to the continuance or repeal of the taxes? from the dictates of a *heart*, which wants nothing but the ability of a *head* to ſpread deſtruction on the conſtitution of this country. What a felicity it is, that the powers of men are inadequate to their wills on ſuch occaſions! but the moſt extravagant inſtance of this rant is, his branding the miniſtry, and even the parliament with having acted with *littleneſs* and *fraud*. And this ignominy, which, it ſeems, the liberty of ſpeech allows to be *pronounced* in parliament, he has *publiſhed* to the world. It is an act as becoming *him* to *do*, as for *them* to *ſuffer*.

He perſeveres, "the article of tea is ſlurred "over in the circular letter as it were by acci- "dent.—Nothing is ſaid of a reſolution either "to keep that tax, or to give it up. There is "no fair dealing in any part of the tranſaction." In what does it appear that the article of tea was ſlurred over as by accident? is not the poſitive mention of the other five taxes being to be repealed, without ſpeaking of that on tea, as expreſſive, and as clear, that it was to be continued, as if it had been attended with a thouſand aſſeverations? Was it not in that ſenſe underſtood by the Americans? becauſe he has told you that *one* ſtep is but *one*, does he imagine it neceſſary to declare a reſolution, that what is ſeen to be abſolutely *reſerved*, is *not* to be *given away?* if returning from a journey, he orders his ſervant to take off his boots, does he think it neceſſary to tell him he muſt

leave

conduct in this affair, yet to preclude every means of his eluding a defeat, I will examine this exploſion of verboſity.

The ſimpleneſs of every undertaking conſiſts in its being compounded of as few objects as poſſible. In this inſtance, it conſiſts of two alone; thoſe of reſtoring the ſupreme authority to exertion and vigour in America, and of impoſing a tax as the means of obtaining that end. Thus the *end* and the *means* conſtitute but *two*. Can he conceive an undertaking in which there are neither means nor object? is he ſo ſkilled in any art, that he can ſo ſimplify *two* things as to make them leſs than *two*? where then is the want of its being *ſimple*. Wherein conſiſts the defect of manlineſs? the act indeed impoſed taxes, on ſeveral commodities, in a former adminiſtration, which lord North then diſliked. They were repealed, ſince he was miniſter, for commercial reaſons. But the duty on tea does ſtill preſerve that act in as much energy as before: and the means which are now employing evince that it is ſupported by manlineſs. But that Edmund Burke, who adviſed, harangued, and voted for the puſillanimous retreat of his maſter before rebellion, without riſking an engagement, ſhould charge the miniſtry with unmanlineſs, is an act of confidence not eaſily to be equalled. And as nonſenſe can never be more juſtly applied than to him, it may be ſaid, *none but himſelf can be his parallel.*

Return to lord Hillſborough's letter, you will there be convinced that nothing can be more ingenuous, open, deciſive, or ſteady, in the proceeding, with regard either to the continuance or the repeal of the taxes. You are therein told that the five duties are only intended to be repealed; that it was the preſent intention of the miniſter

to

to lay no more taxes for a revenue; that his lordſhip pledged his honour for the truth of theſe things. All theſe particulars have been moſt religiouſly obſerved. From whence then does this charge ariſe, of diſingenuous concealment, indeciſion, verſatility, with regard either to the continuance or repeal of the taxes? from the dictates of a *heart*, which wants nothing but the ability of a *head* to ſpread deſtruction on the conſtitution of this country. What a felicity it is, that the powers of men are inadequate to their wills on ſuch occaſions! but the moſt extravagant inſtance of this rant is, his branding the miniſtry, and even the parliament with having acted with *littleneſs* and *fraud*. And this ignominy, which, it ſeems, the liberty of ſpeech allows to be *pronounced* in parliament, he has *publiſhed* to the world. It is an act as becoming *him* to *do*, as for *them* to *ſuffer*.

He perſeveres, "the article of tea is ſlurred "over in the circular letter as it were by acci- "dent.—Nothing is ſaid of a reſolution either "to keep that tax, or to give it up. There is "no fair dealing in any part of the tranſaction." In what does it appear that the article of tea was ſlurred over as by accident? is not the poſitive mention of the other five taxes being to be repealed, without ſpeaking of that on tea, as expreſſive, and as clear, that it was to be continued, as if it had been attended with a thouſand aſſeverations? Was it not in that ſenſe underſtood by the Americans? becauſe he has told you that *one* ſtep is but *one*, does he imagine it neceſſary to declare a reſolution, that what is ſeen to be abſolutely *reſerved*, is *not* to be *given away?* if returning from a journey, he orders his ſervant to take off his boots, does he think it neceſſary to tell him he muſt

leave

leave on his ſtockings? I will now aſk him where is *his fair dealing in any part of this tranſaction.*

Like a fox that conſtantly returns to the ſame cover from which he has been frequently hunted, that by leading the hounds through brakes and briars, and by earthing at laſt, hath eluded the purſuit of the huntſmen; ſo this orator returning to the ſame ſubject, expects by leading you through the brambles of abſurdity and ſelf-contradiction, and by diving into the vaſt profund, eternally to eſcape. The ſubſequent paſſage is an inſtance of his deſign. "If you mean," ſays he, "to follow your true motives and your "public faith, give up your tax on tea for raiſing "a revenue, the principle of which has, in effect, "been diſclaimed in your name, and which pro-"duces you no advantage; no, not a penny. Or "if you chooſe to go on with a poor pretence, "inſtead of a ſolid reaſon, and will ſtill adhere to "your *cant* of commerce, you have ten thouſand "times more ſtrong commercial reaſons for giving "up this duty on tea, than for abandoning the "five others, that you have already renounced."

This paſſage is addreſſed to the commons. He preſumes to bid them follow their *true motives* and their public *faith*, to give up the tax on tea, the principle of which has been diſclaimed in their name. This alludes to lord Hillſborough's letter, in which not a ſyllable is ſaid of the commons, but that the miniſtry intend to *propoſe* to parliament to take off the tax. The faith of parliament has never been either mentioned or alluded to in that letter; and as to the diſclaimer, that falſity hath been ſufficiently exploded. However, in plain Engliſh, it is. If you chooſe to go on with your poor pretence, you are a pack of fellows

without

without ſolid reaſon, and *canters* on commerce. I ſhall leave the commons to anſwer, or to acquieſce in theſe charges as they pleaſe. As to the ten thouſand times ſtronger commercial reaſons for giving up the duty on tea, than the others, I will give no farther anſwer.

" The American conſumption of tea, is an-
" nually, I believe, worth 300,000*l.* at the leaſt
" farthing. If you urge the American violence
" as a juſtification of your perſeverance in enforc-
" ing this tax, you know that you can never an-
" ſwer this plain queſtion: Why did you repeal
" the others given in the ſame act, whilſt the very
" ſame violence ſubſiſted?" But where is this violence urged as a juſtification of perſevering to enforce this tax? Eſtabliſh the *if* and you ſhall have the *anſwer*. But without that the truth ſhall be told you. The taxes were not repealed to appeaſe the violence, but for commercial reaſons. The tea tax was continued, becauſe that violence ſhould not be complied with, but ſubdued. " But," ſays he, " you did not find that violence ceaſe upon
" that conceſſion." The miniſtry did never expect it. They had been long convinced, by his and his miniſters *conceſſion*, that their outrage would be rather encreaſed: and therefore they prepared to defeat that violence by other means than conceſſions. But let me give you his anſwer: " No.
" Becauſe the conceſſion was far ſhort of anſwer-
" ing the principle which Lord Hillſborough had
" abjured, or even the pretence on which the re-
" peal of the other taxes was announced." What principle is it that his lordſhip hath abjured? Not the principle of re-eſtabiſhing the ſupreme authority over the Americans, becauſe the tax is left to ſuſtain its right. Not that of impoſing no further

taxes

taxes on America, becauſe that is alſo preſerved. But what is the plain Engliſh of *ſatisfying a principle?* The pretence, as he calls it, the true commercial principle, on which the repeal of the other taxes was announced, was certainly carried into execution. But will not every conceſſion be ſhort of ſatisfying the Americans, that does not yield a plenary renunciation of the Britiſh ſovereignty to the demands of rebellion? Is that the ſatisfaction which he urges to be granted?

He continues attempting to reaſon, "and becauſe, "by enabling the Eaſt-India company to open a "ſhop for defeating the American reſolution not to "pay that ſpecific tax, you manifeſtly ſhewed a "hankering after the principle of the act, which "you formerly had renounced."

What ſort of ſhop it was the Eaſt-India company were enabled to open; and how effectually it defeated the American reſolution, of not paying the tax; the breaking open the ſhips which carried the tea to the colonies, the committing felony, and throwing the tea into the rivers, ſufficiently explain. But I conceive theſe ſhops can not be properly ſaid to be for defeating, although they may for eſtabliſhing the reſolution of *not* paying the tax. That this attempt, to enable the company, ſhewed ſomething more than a hankering after the principle of the act, the ſupport of the parliamentary authority, I readily agree. But I abſolutely deny, becauſe it has been irrefragably proved, that this principle was ever renounced.

"Whatever road you take," ſays he, "tends "to a compliance with this motion. It opens to "you at the end of every viſto. Your commerce, "your policy, your promiſes, your reaſons, your "pretences, your conſiſtency, your inconſiſtency—

"all

" all jointly oblige you to this repeal." Such being the caſe, that all things, and even thoſe that were never conjoined in the promotion of the ſame event till this hour, *Conſiſtency* with *inconſiſtency*, are united to oblige the miniſtry to repeal this act, why, in the name of nonſenſe, has this orator beſtowed ſo much lung-labour in perſuading them to *accompliſh* that which they are *neceſſitated* ro perform? As when an alarm is given at the door of a dove-houſe, the pigeons hurry out in confuſion at the top of it, and leave their neſts and young to whatever may arrive: ſo in any commotion from within, the words of this orator preſs in tumult through his mouth, and leave the half-hatched and unfledged ideas never to attain maturity.

Every ſtep he takes he advances in his confidence of aſſertion. " It ſtill ſticks in our throats, " if we go ſo far, the Americans will go farther. " We donot know that." By this he muſt certainly mean they do *not* know whether it *ſticks in their throats* or not. For it has been *long known*, that they have already gone *farther* on *conceſſion*. " However," he ſays, " the houſe ought from ex- " perience rather preſume the contrary." I will appeal to this experience for a refutation of what he ſays. When the duty on molaſſes was ordered to be ſtrictly collected, in Mr. Grenville's miniſtry, and other things were enacted, diſpleaſing to the Americans, they made no oppoſition to the legiſlative authority of this realm. They acquieſced therewith, and petitioned parliament for redreſs. When the ſtamp act was oppoſed in parliament, and that ſplit-devil diſtinction of the legiſlature, into the right of laying external, and not internal, taxes on the colonies was engendered, this opinion was greedily

greedily adopted by the Americans. It was fostered by the repeal of the ſtamp act. And then the perſuaſion prevailed among them, that the legiſlature of Britain had no right to tax them, either externally or internally. In conſequence of this progreſſion in the principles of rebellion, when the external duties were laid on goods imported into America, they openly refuſed to obey the legiſlative authority; advanced to felony; and are now in actual rebellion. As all theſe were the conſequences of *conceſſion*, ought not the parliament to conclude, from experience, that a *farther conceſſion* will create ſtill greater demands, until there be nothing left to be conceded?

"Can they do more, or can they do worſe, if "the Commons yield this point?" he aſks. He anſwers, "he thinks this conceſſion will rather fix "a turnpike to prevent their farther progreſs." The queſtion, ſingular as it is, is a mere nothing in compariſon with the anſwer. It is indeed a ſingular conception, that men who can do nothing more, nor worſe, ſhould be indulged with any thing without correction. But let me come to the turnpike. The thing which is to ſet up and *fix* this turnpike, to prevent their farther progreſs, is the *taking down* of an act of parliament, that will not let them go through *without* paying. Now, by what genius, by what art, this cunning-man can make the taking *down* of a law, that ſtops them *until they pay*, and thereby leaving the paſſage abſolutely free, can be *like fixing* a *turnpike* to *prevent* their farther progreſs, is a *ſimilitude* in which I can ſee *no* likeneſs. However, it is not without a precedent equally pre-eminent. When May Drummon, in one of *her* holdings forth, to a quaking congregation, was ſpeaking of the world, ſhe told them,

them, it was as *round* —— as *round* —— as a horſe's head. Such is the amazing reſemblance between the intellectual faculties of theſe two celebrated *ſpeakers*.

" It is impoſſible," he ſays, " to anſwer for " bodies of men." Or ſingle ones either, were they all like this orator. " But he is ſure the " natural effect of fidelity, clemency, kindneſs in " governors, is peace, good-will, order, and " eſteem, on the part of the governed." And ſo am I too; but not towards rebels. Has he not been taught the contrary by the repeal of the ſtamp act? He ſeems not to diſtinguiſh between the effects of conceſſion to dutiful and to rebellious ſubjects. The hiſtory of Charles the firſt irrefragably evinces, that every conceſſion of that king to the progenitors of theſe men, who were then rebels, as their deſcendants now are, inflamed their impudence; encreaſed their outrages; and aggravated their demands; until by conſecutive yieldings to all they aſked, that ſovereign was murdered; the people robbed, of their rights of election by their repreſentatives voting themſelves an *eternal* parliament; and the conſtitution fundamentally ſubverted. Every conceſſion *then*, as in the caſe of the Rockingham conceſſion *ſince*, ſtrengthened their perſuaſion that *fear* had been the motive to it; that the ſame daſtardly ſpirit would conſtantly give way before their moſt atrocious demands; and that nothing would be denied. Is it ignorance in the nature of humankind? Is it a prepenſe deſign to ſubvert the ſtate, rather than yield to reaſon? or is it *ſelf-intereſt*, which, counteracting all the ſalutary proceedings of the miniſtry, and every virtue of higheſt eſtimation among mankind that urges

this man to involve this nation in ruin, rather than not to avert his own.

" And now," ſays he, " Mr. Cornwall having " ſpoken what he thought neceſſary upon the " narrow part of the ſubject, I have given him, I " hope, a ſatisfactory anſwer." If his hope of a joyful reſurrection, be not more *ſure* and *certain*, than this of having ſatisfied Mr. Cornwall; or any man of common-ſenſe, he cannot do better than follow the attorney's example, in a viſion of Don Quivedo, and prepare himſelf with a ſpeech, in order to plead a demurrer on the day of judgment.

He continues, " Mr. Cornwall next preſſes him " by a variety of *direct* challenges, and *oblique* re- " flexions, to ſay ſomething on the hiſtorical " part." This Mr. Cornwall is a dreadful adverſary, he attacks him *alone* in *front* and *flank*. You ſhall ſee how he defends himſelf. On this account " he will open himſelf fully on that im- " portant and delicate ſubject: not for the ſake " of telling Mr. Speaker a long ſtory, which he " knows Mr. Speaker is not particularly fond of, " but for the ſake of the weighty *inſtructions* " that he *flatters* himſelf will neceſſarily reſult " from it."

You cannot have forgotten, that in his exordium he *exclaims*, " that for *nine long years*, ſeſſion after ſeſſion, the Commons had been laſhed round and round a miſerable circle, till their heads turned giddy, and their ſtomachs turned *up* the arguments they had received." And now he enters into a continuance of that long nine years laſhing, in a *long* ſtory, for the ſake of the weighty *inſtructions* the houſe may receive. And this he undertakes, although, he had aſſured you in

that

that exordium, that " invention was exhauſted; reaſon fatigued; and experience had given judgement." Is it, therefore, to be admired, that neither Mr. Speaker nor the members are fond of ſuch long and ſickening ſtories?

It ſeems indeed to be no common act of *ſelf-adulation*, in Mr. Burke, to imagine, after all the preceding time and circumſtances, that *he* alone ſhould conceive that his invention was not exhauſted, nor his reaſon fatigued. For if he did not ſecretly except himſelf, by what means could he have found *inſtructions* in this inſtance? The plain meaning of all this is, you the Commons of Great Britain, are five hundred and fifty-ſeven ſuch thick-ſculled raſcals, that after being laſhed for nine long years, till your inventions were exhauſted, and your reaſons fatigued, if you had any, you remain ſo egregiouſly ignorant of this important ſubject, that I, who alone underſtand it, am obliged to tell you a long ſtory for the ſake of *inſtructing* you in that which is neceſſary for you to know. In what a miſerable ſituation muſt the preſent parliament have been, had not Mr. Burke been re-elected a repreſentative! From whom could they have had one word of weighty inſtruction, ſince he muſt have run away with all the underſtanding of the houſe. Thus an *over-ſcrupulous delicacy* of aſſuming ſuperior knowledge, like the light in the glow-worm's tail, ſhines in this orator, and diſcovers itſelf the more evidently by means of that impervious obſcurity which ſurrounds him in the ſenate. He is the pillar of ſmoke by day, and of fire by night, that guides them through the wilderneſs of America.

However, he promiſes, " it ſhall not be longer, " if he can help it, than ſo ſerious a matter re- " quires." And then, with a view to keep his word and *ſhorten* his ſtory, he aſks permiſſion " to lead the Commons *very far back*, back to the " act of navigation, the corner ſtone of the po- " licy of this country, with regard to the co- " lonies."

" That policy," he continues, " was from the " beginning purely commercial, and the com- " mercial ſyſtem was wholly reſtrictive. It was " the ſyſtem of a monopoly. No trade was let " looſe from that conſtraint, but merely to enable " the coloniſts to diſpoſe of what in the courſe of " your trade you could not take; or to enable " them to diſpoſe of ſuch articles as we forced up- " on them, and for which, without ſome degree " of liberty, they could not pay.——This prin- " ciple of commercial monoply, runs through no " leſs than twenty-nine acts of parliament, from " the year 1666, to the unfortunate period of " 1764." The nature and effects of this ſyſtem of a monoply ſhall be explained to you in a ſub- ſequent part of this anſwer.

" In all thoſe acts," he adds, " the ſyſtem of " commerce is eſtabliſhed as that from whence " alone you propoſe to make the coloniſts contri- " bute" (he means directly, and by the operation of the ſuperintending legiſlative power) " to the " ſtrength of the empire. He *ventures* to ſay, " that during that whole period, a parliamentary " revenue from thence was never *once* in *contem-* " *plation.*" I ſhould indeed have entertained a leſs doubt, that this accurate ſpeaker does really know all that was in *contemplation*, during that pe- riod and on that ſubject, in the heads of other men,

if

if he had ſhewn himſelf to be better acquainted with that which hath *paſſed* in his *own*. However, he hath wonderful gifts from nature. And as he *hears* what has done *ſounding*, why may he not have perceived all that hath paſſed ſixty years before he was born? whatever may be your concluſion on that head, you will not deny him the merit of being an *adventurer*.

" Accordingly, ſays he, in all the number of " laws paſſed, with regard to the plantations, the " words which diſtinguiſh revenue laws ſpecifically " as ſuch, were, he thinks, premeditately avoid- " ed." He allows that " a form of words certain- " ly does not alter the nature of the law, nor " abridge the power of the law-giver. He ſtates " theſe facts to ſhew, not what was the parlia- " mentary right, but what has been the ſettled " policy. Our revenue laws have *uſually* a *title* " purporting their being *grants*; and the words *give* " *and grant*, *uſually* precede the enacting parts." " From this premiſe, which expreſſes a *cuſtom* to be *uſual*, and therefore does conſequently imply that it was *ſometimes obſerved*, and at *others not*, he draws an *abſolute* concluſion, that the terms *give and grant* being omitted in the acts, relative to America, render them not laws for a revenue, an induction which nothing but an *univerſal practice*, of inſerting the preceding words into all our revenue laws, can warrant. For as the *omiſſion* of them is *uſual*, as well as the *inſertion*, that omiſſion affords a precedent for their being as legally to be left out, as the other to be inſerted in all ſuch ſtatutes. This is the precedent which the parliament obſerved in the revenue acts relative to America. And therefore when " duties were impoſed on the coloniſts in acts of king Charles the ſecond, and in acts

of William, though no one title of giving *an aid to his majeſty*, or any other of the uſual titles to revenue acts, was to be found in any of them till 1764." It is evident they were nevertheleſs *revenue laws*, according to *uſual* cuſtom.

He then adds, "nor were the words *give and* "*grant*, in any preamble, until the 6th of George "the ſecond, 1773." And hence it reſults, that although he *thought* the words *give and grant* were *premeditately left out* of the American acts for 104 years, he *knew* them *premeditately to be put in* for 44 of that time. Hence it is evident alſo, that theſe words "which diſtinguiſh revenue laws ſpe-"cifically as ſuch, were no innovation in 1764, becauſe they had been thus applied more than thirty years before that time. The means, by which he attempts to evade the contradiction which that act gives to his preceding aſſertion, are not leſs curious than the aſſertion itſelf. "However," ſays he, "the title of this act of George the ſe-"cond, notwithſtanding the words of donation, "conſiders it merely as a regulation of trade, *an* "*act for the better ſecuring the trade of his majeſty's* "*ſugar colonies in America.*" And thus according to this orator's mode of arguing, the mention of the word *trade*, for which *money* is given by parliament, makes it no *donation*. And for the ſame reaſon, if a man chriſtens his ſon by the name of *Mary* his *ſex* is changed. Would an act, raiſing money for the better ſecurity of the linnen *trade* of his majeſty's kingdom of Ireland, followed by the words *give and grant*, be no donation, becauſe it was to regulate trade?

To the preceding he adds, "the act of George "the ſecond was made on a compromiſe of all, "and at the expreſs deſire of a part of the co-

"lonies

" lonies themſelves. It was therefore, in ſome " meaſure, with their conſent; and having a title " directly purporting only a *commercial regulation*, " and being in truth nothing more, the words " were paſſed by, at a time when no jealouſy was " entertained, and things were little ſcrutini- " zed." You ſhall ſoon diſcern, how ridiculouſly he wriggles, to get out of an uneaſy ſituation; like a bad horſeman with a galled backſide, and yet can find no remiſſion of his ſoreneſs.

What credit is to be given to this account of a compromiſe of all the colonies will be evident from governour Bernard's letter, dated in 1763, which this ſpeaker cites, in confirmation of what he hath ſaid. " At the time of making the mo- " laſſes act, now thirty years ago, it was aſſerted " by the Weſt Indians, that as the Britiſh Weſt " Indian plantations were capable of taking off all " the produce of America, the ſending ſuch pro- " duce to foreign plantations ought to be diſ- " couraged. To this the North Americans then " anſwered, by denying (I believe with greater " truth) that the Britiſh plantations were incapable " of taking off all the produce of North Ame- " rica fit for the Weſt India markets. The Weſt " Indians prevailed, and a duty of 50 per cent. " was laid by parliament on all molaſſes imported " from iſlands not belonging to Great-Britain."

Was this act made, in conſequence of a *compromiſe*, which by that *exceſſive* duty on molaſſes, not of the produce of the Britiſh iſlands, would have ruined the North American trade, had it not been evaded by contraband? would the Americans, on ſo intereſting an occaſion, have paid no attention to the *new words* of *giving and granting*, had theſe terms been exceptionable; or had any doubt been

entertained of the right of the Britiſh legiſlature, to lay what taxes they thought proper on the colonies? do not facts eternally ariſe to confute this orator in all his aſſertions? and when he quotes the preceding letter of governor Bernard, who gives his opinion, not as the orator cites it, "that "it *was* an act of *prohibition* not of revenue," but that he *believes* it was originally deſigned for a prohibition. But ſuppoſe it were, in what ſenſe does that circumſtance alter the meaning of the terms, *give and grant*, or anſwer the intention of this orator, when he aſſerts they were *premeditately* avoided for more than a century?

"This," ſays he, "is certainly true, that no "act avowedly for the purpoſe of revenue, and "with the ordinary title and recital, *taken together*, "is found in the ſtatute book until the year he "hath mentioned, that is in the year 1764." What a futile and obvious evaſion of the reality of things is here intended! the *title* and *recital* are not in the *ſame* act. But are they not ſeparately in diſtinct acts? if they are not, will not his own opinion, in one place, counterbalance it in another? "that a *form of words* does not alter the nature of "the law, nor abridge the power of the law-"giver." To what intent then is all this *parlaver* about the form of words ſo *laſhingly* and ſo *nauſeatingly* urged?

"The ſcheme of a colony revenue, by Britiſh "authority, appeared therefore to the Americans "in the light of a great innovation; the words of "governor Bernard's ninth letter, written in No-"vember 1765, ſtates this idea very ſtrongly. "It muſt, ſays he, have been ſuppoſed, *ſuch an* "*innovation as a parliamentary taxation*, would "cauſe a great *alarm*, and meet with much *op-*

poſition,

" *poſition*, in moſt parts of America; it was *quite*
" *new* to the people, and had no *viſible bounds* ſet
" to it. After ſtating the weakneſs of government
" there, he ſays, was this a time to introduce *ſo*
" *great a novelty*, as a parliamentary inland tax-
" ation in America? whatever the right might
" have been, this mode of uſing it was abſolutely
" new in policy and practice."

If this orator be poſſeſſed of any degree of merit, it lies in its being undiſcoverable, whether his aſſertions originate from ſheer ignorance, intended falacy, or premeditated miſchief. By the antecedent quotation of governor Bernard's letter, it is manifeſt he deſigned to create a perſuaſion in you, that it related ſolely to the act paſſed in 1764, relative to the preceding act of George the ſecond, which laid ſo vaſt a duty on molaſſes imported from other iſlands than the Britiſh. It is this act, which he would induce you to believe, was that which was conſidered as an innovation of a *parliamentary taxation*, that would cauſe an *alarm*; meet with much *oppoſition*; be *quite new* to the people; and which had no *viſible bounds* ſet to it. Yet ſuch is the fact, that all the preceding circumſtances have no more relation to the act of 1764, than to the firſt chapter of the Alcoran. On the paſſing of that act, they never diſputed the legiſlative authority. They thought of no innovation, and made no oppoſition to it. On the contrary, in the 5th letter of governor Bernard, the people of the Maſſachuſets petitioned parliament for redreſs from that duty, and from ſeveral other things contained in that act. And by that application, it was fully evinced, that they acknowledged the authority by which that act was made. Every ſyllable, that this orator hath thus applied to the act of 1764, ſtands in governor

Ber-

Bernard's letter, which he quotes, expreſſive of the ſtamp-act only of 1765, the mention of which he conceals. And thus he inſidiouſly repreſents the former, "as the *great novelty of a parliamentary* "*external taxation in America*," although all the antecedent circumſtances are relative to an *internal* taxation on paper. And then he ſays, "whatever the right might have been, this mode of "uſing it was abſolutely new in policy and practice;" although it were as old in both as the reign of Charles the ſecond, which he himſelf allows. If this be the reſult of ignorance, can he for the future be conſidered as a man of common underſtanding? if it be the effect of an intended falacy, at what rate ſhall his integrity be eſtimated? if it be the conſequence of premeditated miſchief, what will you think of his heart? if a combination of them all, what——I will not aſk the queſtion. "He now thinks the commercial reſtraint is full "as hard a law for the Americans to live under, "as that for the American revenue, if uncompenſated he thinks it to be a condition of as "egregious ſervitude as men can be ſubject to. "But America bore it from the fundamental act "of navigation until 1764." To which I will add until 1765. And ſo ſhe would have done to this hour, if the enemies of this kingdom had not incenſed the coloniſts to rebellion.

But not contented with aſſertions, he will give you his reaſons, and thus overſet on the other ſide what might have ſtood, for a ſhort time, had he been leſs buſy in propping it. "Why?" his anſwer is, "becauſe men do bear the inevitable conſtitution "of their original nature with all its infirmities." And what infirmities either originally natural, or adventitious do men *not bear*, which are *inevitable*? what a precious circumlocution of no meaning

ing, do the preceding words exhibit. The inference however is admirable. Becauſe thoſe men who have, by nature, hump-backs, bandy-legs, *patriotic* eyes, or other infirmities of their *bodily conſtitutions*, which they cannot avoid, do bear them; the Americans bore the navigation act, which was a *hump* in their political conſtitution, until 1764, when they attempted to be *freed* from what was *inevitably* to *hold them*. This *if* uncompenſated, he thinks as rigorous a ſervitude as men can be ſubject to. God ſend us all, ſay I, erect poſtures, ſtraight limbs, and eyes unlike the immaculate Lord Mayor, or the lord have mercy on us! for otherwiſe, being thus prepared in body, our *minds* will inevitably bear ſlavery of courſe. Paddy Blake's echo would have given a more rational anſwer to that *why*; for when any one cried aloud *how do you do captain Blake*, the echo very ſenſibly anſwered for the captain, *pretty well I thank you*. From the preceding paſſage, it appears, that the navigation act, which a few pages before "was "the corner ſtone of our policy, with regard to "the colonies," is now become an infirmity in that very policy.

After a ſhort *exclamation* on the act of navigation, which, with its *infirmities*, "grew with their "growth, and *ſtrengthened* with their *ſtrength*," he talks of their monopoliſt, his riches, his immenſe "capital, which primarily employed for his own "benefit, enriched the others, and was a hot-"bed to them;" he adds, "nothing in the hiſ-"tory of mankind is like their progreſs. For his "part, he never caſts an eye on their flouriſhing "commerce," under a monopoly, "their culti-"vated commodious life," under a ſtate of ſlavery. "But they ſeem to him rather antient na-

tion

" tions grown to perfection through a long ſeries
" of fortunate events, and a train of ſucceſsful in-
" duſtry, accumulating wealth in many centuries,
" than the colonies of yeſterday; than a ſet of
" miſerable out-caſts, a few years ago, not ſo much
" ſent as thrown out on the bleak and barren ſhore
" of a deſolate wilderneſs, three thouſand miles
" from all civilized intercourſe."

I ſhall withhold my remarks on the happy ſtate of the Americans for a few minutes. In the mean while, I readily agree with this orator, that ſuch a ſet of *miſerable outcaſts*, part rebels, part felons, were thrown *out* from hence, and *into* the Maſſachuſets and Virginia; that the bleakeſt and moſt barren ſhore of the moſt deſolate wilderneſs upon earth, would have been too good and too hoſpitable a retreat for them. "All this," he ſays, "was
" done by England, whilſt England purſued trade
" and forgot revenue." Since the revolution at leaſt, I think that *revenue* has not been forgotten, in this kingdom. And as England has created the commerce, enriched the coloniſts, and made them ſo happy, does it not ſeem reaſonable that a revenue ſhould now be thought on for America? perhaps the ſubſequent paſſage of your orator may juſtify ſuch a proceeding. "He ſays, we not only
" acquired commerce, but actually created the
" very objects of trade in America, and by that
" creation raiſed the trade of this nation at leaſt
" four-fold. America had the compenſation of
" your capital, which made her bear her ſervi-
" tude." Hence it appears, that no mother was ever more indulgent to her progeny, than Britannia to her colonies. It *created* the objects of their commerce; it ſupported them with her capital; and if the trade of this kingdom was encreaſed four-fold by theſe means, was it not owing to herſelf; and

you

you have already ſeen from the words of this orator, how rapidly the Americans advanced to a cultivated and commodious life, and attained a degree of accumulated wealth, to which antient nations arrived but through a long ſeries of fortunate events, and a train of ſucceſsful induſtry. If this unexampled progreſs to eaſe and happineſs, whilſt you have been oppreſſed by debts, and burthened with taxes, be a ſtate of *ſervitude*, make me a *ſlave!* give me the *effects*! let others find felicity in the *ſound* of liberty.

He perſiſts "ſhe had another compenſation "which you are now going to take from her. "She had, except the commercial reſtraint, every "characteriſtic mark of a free people in all her "external and internal concerns. She had the "image of the Britiſh conſtitution. She had the "ſubſtance. She was taxed by her own repre-"ſentatives. She choſe moſt of her own ma-"giſtrates. She paid them all. She had in effect "the ſole diſpoſal of her own internal govern-"ment." All theſe ſhe would have ſtill preſerved, had ſhe obeyed the law which impoſed the duties on the importation of the commodities already mentioned. All theſe circumſtances are correlative with thoſe of all the cities and towns corporate in England. They are charteral rights, ſubordinate to the ſupreme legiſlative authority." And do theſe rights take from the conſtituents, of the reſpective corporations, any the minuteſt part, of their liberty, becauſe they are ſtill obedient to the laws of parliament? By what change in the nature of things can the ſame cauſe reduce the coloniſts to *ſervitude*, which has been conſtantly deemed a productive of *freedom* in England? America ſtill poſſeſſes the ſame image, the ſame

ſubſtance

ſubſtance of the Britiſh conſtitution, which you enjoy. And on what account rebellion and ingratitude ſhould be preſented with *more*, is a queſtion not eaſily to be diſcerned by loyal ſubjects.

His obſervations are equal to all the other exertions of his intellect. He tells you "this *whole* "ſtate of commercial *ſervitude*, and civil *liberty*, "taken together, is certainly not *perfect freedom*." Which is as ſhrewd a remark as that a magpye being part *white* and part *black*, taken together is not *all white*. "But, he adds, "comparing it "with the ordinary circumſtances of human na- "ture, it was a happy and a liberal condition." Such is the concluſion of his account of American *ſervitude*; exactly like the *freedom* of Britons, a *happy* and a *liberal* condition. A condition which this orator, and his adherents, firſt taught theſe Americans the inſolence to queſtion, the hardineſs to deſpiſe, and the madneſs to forfeit by rebellion. Theſe are the bleſſings for which the coloniſts are obliged to thoſe, who wearing the patriotic maſk of ſaving them, have at once involved their country and her colonies in this unnatural contention.

"He knows," he tells you, "that great, and "not unſucceſsful, pains have been taken to in- "flame our minds, by an outcry, in this houſe "and out of it, that in America the act of navi- "gation neither is, nor never was obeyed. But "as an anſwer to this," he affirms, "its authority "never was diſputed." If he *diſobeyed* the ten commands, does he imagine, that his not *diſputing* the *authority* which promulged them, will be taken as a proof of his *obedience* to what they injoin? that would be an admirable and an eaſy method of attoning for ſins. In fact, he conſiders *his* affirmation as an *anſwer* to his *own* poſition.

However,

However, to be always conſiſtent with himſelf, in the ſubſequent words he ſays, " that the autho-
" rity which was *never* diſputed, was no where
" diſputed for any *length* of time, and on the
" whole that it was well obſerved." Thus it turns out, that what was *never diſputed*, was nevertheleſs *diſputed*, but not *long*. How well it was obſerved, his ſucceeding words will convince you.
" Whenever the act preſſed hard, many of the in-
" dividuals indeed evaded it. Theſe ſcattered in-
" dividuals, never denied the law, and never
" obeyed it." This is certainly an excellent proof of laws being *well* obeyed, becauſe many individuals *evaded* it. Is it not an admirable and judicious aſſertion. " That the breach of the laws
" is nothing." What a number of individuals have been innocently executed at Tyburn for committing Mr. Burke's *nothing!* Is it not a pity that he is not miniſter, to repeal thoſe cruel acts which ſend ſuch a multiplicity of guiltleſs men to death, for doing nothing at all? To the foregoing he adds, that " theſe ſcattered individuals
" never obeyed the law, and never denied it." And thus by way of diſproof of what had been ſaid in the houſe, that the navigation act was *never obeyed*, he aſſerts that its *authority* was *never diſputed*, although it was *ſometimes* diſputed: and that the law was *well* obeyed upon the whole, although it was *diſobeyed* by thoſe on whom it preſſed hard. And thoſe you ſhall preſently ſee were the whole commercial ſubjects of America. Thus, by way of apology for his American favourites, he allows that they never diſputed the legiſlative authority which enacted that law, but refuſed to comply with it; that is, they were not *miſtaken* in their *judgments*, but *rogues* by *inclination*, in which

they

they perſiſt to this hour. The whole of this paſſage is a piece of logical induction, ſo exquiſitely curious and unprecedented, that it cannot but eſtabliſh his reputation as a reaſoner beyond all poſſibility of demolition. But ſuch is the peculiarity of his nature, he cannot be ſatisfied until he has adduced every proof which can refute what he himſelf has advanced. Accordingly, he ſays, the "laws were not *better obeyed* in this kingdom, from "Portland Frith to the iſle of Wight," which affords a fair inference, undoubtedly, that they *were* obeyed in America. And that the other parts of this kingdom are not ſmugglers. Altho' he has ſo happily eſtabliſhed his aſſertion by arguments, he is nevertheleſs reſolved to ſupport it by authority. "I take it for granted," ſays he, "that the au-"thority of governor Bernard, in this point, is "indiſputable. Speaking of theſe laws, as they "regarded that part of America, now in ſo un-"happy a condition, he ſays, *I believe they are no* "*where better ſupported than in this province. I do* "*not pretend it is entirely free from a breach of theſe* "*laws; but that ſuch a breach, if diſcovered, is* "*juſtly puniſhed.*" But is this a proof that they are duly obeyed, becauſe the *breach* of them is juſtly puniſhed if it be diſcovered?

But facts ſpeak for themſelves. In the third letter of the ſame governor, and on the ſame ſubject, he ſays, "the publication of orders for the "ſtrict execution of the molaſſes act has cauſed "a greater alarm than the taking Fort William "Henry did in the year 1757. The merchants "ſay, there is an end of the trade of this pro-"vince; that it is ſacrificed to the Weſt-Indian "planters; petitions from the trading towns have "been preſented to the general court; and a large

"committee

" committee of both houſes is ſitting every day " to prepare inſtructions to their agents." If theſe laws were well obeyed, and none but *ſcattered* individuals evaded them, whence did this *univerſal* alarm ariſe, on their being *obliged* to pay the duty? on what account did *all* the merchants pronounce the *trade* of that province to be at an end; if, antecedent to that time, the law and the payment of the duties had not been univerſally eluded? Thus, in calling the evidence of governor Bernard to his aid, your Orator has abſolutely confirmed the truth of that which he ſet out to diſprove. "That in America the Act of Navigation " neither is, nor ever was obeyed."

He proceeds. " Whether you were right or " wrong in eſtabliſhing the colonies on the prin- " ciples of commercial monopoly, rather than on " that of revenue, is, at this day, a problem of " mere ſpeculation. You cannot have both by the " ſame authority. To join together the reſtraints " of an univerſal internal and external monopo- " ly, with an univerſal internal and external taxa- " tion, is an unnatural union; perfect uncompen- " ſated ſlavery. You have long ſince decided for " yourſelf and them; and you and they have " proſpered exceedingly under that deciſion."

With reſpect to the ſpeculative problem I have nothing to ſay. But in order to place his aſſertion, that we cannot have what he denominates a commercial monopoly, and a revenue by the ſame authority, it is expedient that this monopoly be explained to you. To this intent it ſeems neceſſary to lay before you a ſuccinct account of the American trade. It ſhall be firſt conſidered relative to the exportation from the colonies. All the iſlands belonging to Great Britain, in the Weſt-Indies,

are open to the ſale of whatever the American colonies do produce; and America, ſouth of Florida, to that of their rice. 2. They trade to the Madeira and Azores iſlands with their productions, from whence they carry back the wines of thoſe countries. 3. All the parts of Europe, ſouth of Cape Finiſtre, are open to them for fiſh, lumber, rice, grain, flour, and ſugars of foreign growth. 4. To the north of that cape, their commerce is prohibited, without firſt arriving in ſome port of Great Britain. Tobacco, indico, furs, hemp, ſilk, turpentine, maſts, yards, &c. are to be landed in Great Britain only. Can this be deemed an univerſal monopoly reſpecting this kingdom? But the word monopoly implies no kind of injuſtice, if the effects of it be not injurious to thoſe whom it excludes. Let me examine whether the preceding injunctions be to the benefit or diſadvantage of the coloniſts. The colonies in America, on a medium, are not leſs than three thouſand miles from Britain; and from ſome of the ports on the northern and ſouthern ſhores of the European continent, they are much further. In all commercial intercourſe, nothing is more neceſſary and advantageous, than the means of ſpeedily tranſmitting intelligence from one place to another. Letters from Britain, or from any of the preceding ports, cannot be conveyed to America, and anſwers received in leſs than three months, on a medium. And this inevitable circumſtance is attended with ſuch manifeſt inconveniencies, that it may be eſtimated at an almoſt impracticability of correſpondence. The conſequences which muſt ariſe from this delay and uncertainty, are ſometimes crouded markets, which reduce the prices of their commodities; at others, the loſs of profit by being uninformed

uninformed of the proper times of ſending them. Beſides other incidents, which are ſufficiently obvious to mercantile men. In ſuch caſes, and at ſuch diſtances, an *interport* for lodging the American productions becomes abſolutely neceſſary. And if the laws did not require the commodities, above-mentioned, to be landed and lodged in England, the intereſt of the coloniſts would have obliged them to fix on ſuch an intermediate place. The merchants of England are factors for the coloniſts, to whom their productions are conſigned. Theſe have a quick and certain correſpondence with the merchants of other European nations. They are timely acquainted with the riſe and fall of their prices; can ſell them or not, according to their intelligence and judgement. The intereſts of the coloniſts and of their factors are the ſame. The height of the price is the benefit of both; of the former in the ſale, and of the latter in his per *cents*. And as the duties, either paid, or for which bonds have been given, are, on export, either repaid or remitted, the expences which ariſe from commiſſions are more than compenſated by a degree of profit, which could not be otherwiſe obtained. Such being the ſtate of that which, as I ſuppoſe, your orator calls an external monopoly, what injury is hereby done to the Americans? are not you the inhabitants of this kingdom in a worſe ſituation? are there not many of your productions, the export of which is abſolutely interdicted? ſuch as ſheep, wool, wool-fells, yarn of wool, fuller's earth, and others; but is this to be deemed a monopoly, becauſe the national welfare requires that they ſhall not be ſold to others?

With reſpect to the monopoly of internal commerce, I ſuppoſe it may mean, a prohibition

hibition of one colony from ſending their manufactured hats and a few other things into the others; and that of permitting none but Britiſh manufactures, or ſuch merchandize as hath been landed in Britain, proviſions from Ireland excepted, to be imported into America. But when it is conſidered that, of all the manufactures and commodities produced in this kingdom, which pay either exciſe or duty, and moſt others imported into it, ſuch as Portugal and Spaniſh wines, Eaſt-India and other goods, the duties are drawn back on exportation to America; that premiums are given to encourage them to the producing of a variety of commodities, which they otherwiſe would not attempt, and by theſe means to get your money; and bounties on ſome of our exported merchandize, which reduces the prices below what you pay; when they are conſumed by you, certainly there can be nothing either deſtructive or unjuſt, reſpecting the Americans, in ſuch a monopoly. Are not you, the inhabitants of this kingdom, ſubjected to like conditions? can you trade where you pleaſe, and import what you like? neither velvets nor wrought ſilks, ſilk ſtockings and gloves, lawns, gold and ſilver lace, cloths, ſeveral ſorts of iron, and other wares, can be imported by you; and on other commodities the duties are ſo great, that they amount to a prohibition, but to ſuch as are in opulence. Beſides theſe, you are under the reſtraints of monopolies, which reſcind you from the rights of trading to ſeveral parts of the globe; ſuch as thoſe of the Eaſt-India, the Turky, and the Hudſon's bay company.

The

The ſame authority however which eſtabliſhed all theſe commercial reſtraints in Britain, hath in like manner impoſed an internal taxation on land, on light, on moſt of the neceſſaries of life by actual duties, and eventually on all, before they come to the conſumer. Whence, therefore, does it ariſe; from what principle or precedent in polity does he affirm; that the legiſlative authority, which has conſtitutionally effected all theſe things in Britain, cannot effect the like purpoſes in America? or from what circumſtances does it ſpring, that the colonies, into which, as he allows, trade hath overflowed with ſuch redundance of riches, ſhould be unable to afford ſuch taxes as are neceſſary for their own occaſions; whilſt you are bound to furniſh thoſe for England which are ſo enormous?

If ſuch be the *ſtate* of England reſpecting commerce and taxation, according to Mr. Burke it muſt be a perfect uncompenſated *ſlavery*. And yet under this ſlavery you have been happy. The foreign trade of your country and the balance of it have amazingly encreaſed. For in the year 1718, that balance was but 1,585,912*l.* and in 1764, it amounted to 6,179,808*l.* of which balance, the magnified trade of America produced about one ſeventh. As *you* have increaſed in wealth, and proceeded in felicity under this authority, what argument can be adduced that the ſame authority cannot effect the like ends in America? are you to remain content with labouring for the Americans, whilſt they untaxed, unleſs they pleaſe, ſhall revel in a cheap abundance, deride your follies, and renounce that authority which, as ſubjects, they are bound to obey?

He now adds, "the nation never thought of "departing from that choice (relative to America) "until the period immediately on the cloſe of the "laſt war. Then a ſcheme of government, new "in many things, ſeemed to have been adopted. "He ſaw, or thought he ſaw, ſeveral ſymptoms "of a great change whilſt he ſat in the gallery, "a good while before he had the honour of a ſeat "in that houſe." Or ever thought that honour would be his. Oh what a day was that, for Britain's glory, when Edmund Burke was firſt entruſted with your rights and liberties! without that vaſt event, the world had never ſeen this *ſpeech*.

"At that period, ſays he, the neceſſity was "eſtabliſhed of keeping up no leſs than twenty "new regiments, with twenty colonels, capable "of ſeats in this houſe. This ſcheme was adopted "with very general applauſe from all ſides, at the "very time, that by your conqueſts in America, "your danger from foreign attempts, in that part "of the world, was much leſſened, or indeed "quite over."

In what manner the *parliament* could *eſtabliſh* a *neceſſity* of keeping up theſe regiments ſeems not to be eaſily underſtood. But that the *neceſſity* of circumſtances ſhould induce the parliament to ſuch an *eſtabliſhment* is within the reach of comprehenſion. As Hercules traced the oxen into the cave of Cacus, by proceeding contrary to their footſteps; ſo the words of this gentleman are to be taken in the inverted order. And thus it happens, that the tricks of a thief, and the wiles of an orator may be diſcovered by obſerving a ſimilar inveſtigation. Whatever he might think he ſaw, when he ſat in the gallery, it ſeems ſufficiently clear, he did not diſcern that the reaſon for this

military

military eſtabliſhment was that which he conſiders as rendering ſuch an eſtabliſhment uſeleſs; the Americans having nothing to fear from *foreign* attempts, as the Canadians were then become the ſubjects of this realm. It was foreſeen, however, by the miniſtry, that this very circumſtance of, the Americans having no ſuch enemy to fear, would require a military force to oblige them to that duty which they owe the ſovereign authority: more eſpecially as the democratic ſpirit of the Americans, inſtigated by the inſolence of accumulated riches, would inevitably return to the exerciſe of their native oppoſition to this government. Theſe were the *circumſtances*, and not the parliament, which *eſtabliſhed* the *neceſſity* of an army. As to the twenty colonels, who were then made, and capable of ſeats in parliaments, does he imagine that men of that rank may not be as ſafely intruſted with the liberties of their country; and be as free from corrupt influence, as a private clerk to a miniſter, who may have nothing to *loſe* but his place?

I paſs the remarks on "the country gentleman, "theſe patrons of œconomy, and reſiſters of a "ſtanding armed force, who adopted this ſcheme "with ſo much applauſe, and haſten to Mr. "Townſhend, who, in a brilliant harangue, did "*dazzle* the commons, by playing before their "eyes the *image* of a *revenue* to be raiſed in Ame-"rica." To *dazzle* by an *image* is undoubtedly excellent; but when by proſopopœia, he gives *perſonality* to *revenue*, and then makes her *dazzling image*, it is incomparable. However, it imparts no bad idea of Mr. Townſhend's commencing ſhowman, and playing a puppet; and the houſe ſitting as ſpectators and applauding him.

Not content with the diſplay of his parts and acquirements in the antecedent ſubjects, he now deviates from that narrative into the characters of men. In this part you ſhall ſee, that the ſame vanity, the ſame degree of knowledge, the ſame preſervation of veriſimilitude, are exhibited, as in thoſe which he has already delivered. Mr. Grenville is the firſt miniſter whom he preſumes to delineate. He, it ſeems, "with no ſmall ſtudy "of the detail, did not ſeem to have his view, "at leaſt, equally carried to the total circuit of "our affairs; he generally conſidered his objects "in lights that were too detached." And thus he begins this exhibition of his ſkill in characters with a refinement in obſervation, that a man who ſaw things in *detail* and in *detached* lights, did *not* carry his view to the *total* circuit of affairs. As well might he have ſaid that a ſhort-ſighted perſon does not ſee at a great diſtance. And then he adds, "Mr. Grenville was of a maſculine under-"ſtanding," which does not delight in the ſtudy of detail, nor is engaged in the contemplation of detached objects. And thus two irreconcilable characteriſtics, that of attending to the moſt minute, and to the moſt extenſive objects, are united in the ſame intellect. Conditions which are as incompatible in the *mind* of man, as that his *body*, chopped into bits, ſhould be nevertheleſs entire.

He continues his pourtrait. "Mr. Grenville was "bred in a profeſſion, he was bred in the law, "which is, in his opinion, one of the firſt and "nobleſt of human ſciences, a ſcience which does "more to quicken and invigorate the underſtand-"ing, than all the other kinds of learning put "together; but it is not apt, except in perſons "very happily born, to open and liberalize the

"mind

" mind exactly in the ſame proportion." Thus, according to this picture-drawer, Mr. Grenville " with a maſculine underſtanding, a ſtout and reſolute heart, a firſt-rate figure in this country, with an ambition to ſecure to himſelf a well-earned rank in parliament, by a thorough knowledge of its conſtitution, and a perfect practice in all its buſineſs, and with an application undiſſipated and unwearied, was nevertheleſs ſo unhappily born, that his mind could not be opened and liberalized by the law, in exact proportion to the extenſiveneſs of theſe qualities," which ſeems to be ſomewhat extraordinary. But that was not the whole cauſe of Mr. Grenville's being the inadequate man, which this orator repreſents him. For, " paſſing from " that ſtudy, he did not go very largely into the " world, but plunged into buſineſs, he means " into the buſineſs of office, and the limited and " fixed methods of forms eſtabliſhed there." That Mr. Grenville did not go very *largely into* the world, nor *out* of it either, is certainly true; for he lived and died extremely *meagre*. But if he mean largely in a figurative ſenſe, he is certainly miſtaken. His birth, his connections, his company evince the reverſe of that aſſertion. And into what other place could a man, with all the preceding talents, quickened and invigorated by the ſcience of the law, have gone with more propriety in his progreſs to the prime miniſtry, than into office? was it not in that ſituation that he could inſtruct himſelf in the fixed methods and forms eſtabliſhed for carrying the conceptions of a maſculine underſtanding and a reſolute heart into execution?

He now recovers a little from this diſadvantage of office, in which he has placed Mr. Grenville, and adds, " much knowledge is to be had un-

" doubtedly

" doubtedly in that line ; and there is no *know-*
" *ledge* which is not *valuable.*" An obſervation as acute as that of a *Welch* juryman, who told the judge, if the culprit was *hanged*, his life would be in *great danger*. Again he deviates from the merit of that official knowledge, and ſays, " that men " too converſant in office, are rarely minds of re-" markable enlargement ; their habits of office are " apt to give them a turn to think the ſubſtance " of buſineſs not to be much more important than " the forms in which it is conducted. Theſe " forms are adapted to ordinary occaſions ; and " therefore perſons who are nurtured in office, do " admirably well, as long as things go on in the " common order ; but when the high roads are " broken up and the waters out, when a new and " troubled ſcene is opened, and the file affords " no precedent, then it is a greater knowledge of " mankind, and a far more extenſive *comprehen-* " *ſion* of things is requiſite than ever office gave, " or than office can ever give.

Such is his delineation of Mr. Grenville. Inconſiſtencies in ſome degree are probably to be found in the characters of all men ; but moral impoſſibilities in none. Such as a *maſculine underſtanding*, miſtaking the *form* for the *ſubſtance*. A *ſtout* and *reſolute heart*, that was *not* fit to *encounter* difficulties ; a *quickened* and *invigorated* underſtanding, adapted to nothing but *ordinary* occaſions ; a *noble ambition*, and an *unwearied application*, which had made him *no more* than a *clerk* in office. It is a common artifice of bad painters to caricature the features of their pourtraits, in order to make the likeneſſes more ſtriking. But this gentleman draws not from nature, but from a fancy, that in all things conjoins ſuch particularities,

ties, whether intellectual or ſubſtantial, as never can exiſt in the ſame object. In this examination of Mr. Grenville's character, I pretend not to diſtinguiſh how far your orator is in the right or miſtaken, reſpecting ſome perticular parts ſeparately taken. All I would prove is, that they never did, nor ever can exiſt in the ſame perſon, and therefore that he is abſolutely unſkilled in the ſcience of human-kind.

I beg one moment's leave to return to Mr. *Grenville*, for the ſake of exhibiting Mr. Burke. "No "man can believe," ſays he, "that *I* mean to "*lean* upon Mr. Grenville's memory." By which I imagine he means to *bear hard* upon it. "Our "little party-differences have been long ago com-"poſed; and *I* have acted more with him, than "ever *I* acted againſt him." *Party-differences*, and *actings* with and againſt Mr. Grenville, firſt lord of the Treaſury, and chancellor of the Exchequer, by Edmund Burke, clerk to Lord Rockingham, by the curteſy of England called ſecretary, as every man now is, who knotches at the kiln, an account of bricks on a ſtick, to him who tranſacts the buſineſs of the ſtate. Does he conſider his *verboſity* to be *action*? In what other way could he act, either with or againſt Mr. Grenville? Should Robert Mackreith, Eſq; at the end of this ſeſſion of parliament, talk of acting with or againſt Edmund Burke, Eſq; in his votes, with what profound indignation would the latter reſent ſo offenſive a familiarity of expreſſion! and yet honeſt Bob was *ſecretary* to Lord Rockingham, and to a number of other lords at the ſame time; whilſt Mr. Burke was *high in air*, meditating on the ſublime and beautiful, equally as unſuſpecting and unſpected of ever becoming a member of par-

parliament, as Mr. Mackreith, his brother ſecretary, or Rumbold, who was Mackreith's.

I paſs now to his deſcription of the trade of America. " After the war, and in the laſt years " of it, the trade of America had encreaſed far " beyond the ſpeculations of the moſt ſanguine " imagination; it ſwelled *out* on every ſide. It " *filled* its proper channels to the *brim*. It *over-* " *flowed* with a rich redundance, and *breaking* its " *banks* on the *right* and on the *left*; it ſpread out " on ſome places where it was indeed improper " upon others where it was only irregular." The preceding imagery is taken from a river ſwoln with ruins. And as in the character of Mr. Grenville, he hath combined moral impoſſibilities, ſo in this he hath united natural. The trade ſwells *out* on every *ſide*, and yet the *channels* are but *brimful*. It *overflows* its *banks*, and yet it *breaks them down*. Here is indeed an overflowing redundance of ſounding words and foaming contradictions, and as Major O'Flaharty ſays, a very plentiful ſcarcity of every thing elſe.

He then tells you " it is the nature of all great- " neſs not to be exact." If the greatneſs of his oratory be in proportion to his *want* of exactneſs in this ſpeech, then muſt every orator, ancient and modern, yield in greatneſs to Edmund Burke, Eſq; and he has fixed a monument more durable than braſs. In whom is there to be found ſuch amazing *marks* of ſuch *greatneſs? words* without *ideas*; *affirmation* againſt *facts*; *concluſions* which the *premiſes deny*; *animal vivacity* without *imagery*; *reaſoning* without *logic*, and *arguments* which *diſprove* the things they are intended to *eſtabliſh*. Such is the redundant want of exactneſs which ſhall fix him in an eternal permanency of greatneſs; whilſt

that

that of ſpeakers, founded on the oppoſite qualifications, ſhall, like the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion, diſſolve, and leave no wreck behind.

It is his laudable ambition to be conſtantly exhibiting ſome new excellence, in the exertion of his intellectual faculties. He now imitates the great Rochefaucault, and turns maxim-maker. "It "ſhould ſtand," ſays he, "as a fundamental "maxim, that no vulgar precaution ought to be "employed in the cure of evils, which are cloſely "connected with the cauſe of our proſperity." *Maxims* have hitherto been conſidered as a ſpecies of *ſelf evident truths*, and *eaſily* to be put in *practice*. But this *maxim* is in its firſt part impracticable: and in the ſecond repugnant to common-ſenſe. For by what means can a *precaution*, an act which can only *prevent*, be employed to *cure* an *evil* which is actually *exiſting*? But let the *hereditary right* of this orator be acknowledged. Let it be ſuppoſed, that by *precaution*, which can only be uſed *before* the evil arrives, he would ſignify the *means* of curing it *after* it has happened. This metaphor is derived from his knowledge in the art of healing. For of him alone it can be truly ſaid, *he is equally inſtructed in all things*. I will aſk him therefore, if a perſon inflicted with an ague, or the venereal diſeaſe, ſhould conſult him, would he abſtain from curing them by the bark and mercury, becauſe they are vulgar means; and leave the evil cloſely connected with his patient's health, becauſe he had no uncommon remedy to effect a cure? If a mortification had ſeized a limb, or a wen grew on the body of a perſon, muſt the ſurgeon abſtain from amputation, becauſe it is the vulgar means of cure; and leave theſe two evils cloſely connected with the

body?

body? And now I deſire to know, on what this *fundamental maxim* can *ſtand*, that *never* can or ought to *exiſt*?

He then tells you, "Mr. Grenville perhaps turned his eye ſomewhat leſs than was juſt, to the "*incredible* encreaſe of their fair trade, and looked "with ſomething of too inquiſitive a jealouſy to- "wards the contraband; and that the bonds of "the act of navigation were ſtraitened ſo much, "that America was on the point of having no "trade, either contraband or *legitimate*." By which I ſuppoſe he means *lawful*.

I come now to what your orator ſtiles "the "grand manœuvre in the buſineſs of regulating "the colonies. It was the 15th act of the fourth "of George the third, which, beſides containing "ſeveral of the matters to which he hath juſt be- "fore alluded, opened a new principle: and here "properly began the ſecond period of the policy "of this country with regard to the colonies; by "which the ſcheme of a regular plantation par- "liamentary was adopted in theory, and ſettled "in practice, a revenue not ſubſtituted in place "of, but ſuperadded to a monopoly, was enforced "at the ſame time with additional ſtrictneſs, and "the execution put into military hands."

"This act had, *for the firſt time, the title of grant- "ing duties in the colonies and plantations of America*, "and for the firſt time it was aſſerted in the pre- "amble, that it was *juſt* and *neceſſary* that a re- "venue ſhould be raiſed there. Then came the "technical words of *giving and granting*; and thus "a complete American revenue act was made in "all the forms, and with a full avowal of the "right, equity, and policy, and even neceſſity of "of taxing the colonies, with any formal conſent of theirs.

He

He has already told you, that " a form of " words alters not the nature of the law, nor " abridges the power of the law-giver." I ſhall therefore ſay no more reſpecting the title. But was it not *juſt* and *neceſſary* that a revenue ſhould be raiſed in America? *Juſt*, becauſe their trade was ſo *incredibly* encreaſed, and flowing over with a rich redundance. *Neceſſary*, becauſe, in defence of thoſe colonies, this nation is incumbered with a debt of ſeventy millions? As to the *right* of taxing them, he not only avows that it had been exerciſed from the reign of king Charles the 2d; but *he* adviſed, and his miniſter obtained an act declaratory of the parliamentary right to tax them, without *qualification*. In theſe circumſtances, did not *equity* to you, the ſubjects of this realm, demand that the Americans ſhould be taxed in alleviation of the oppreſſions which you bear? Was it not true policy in the miniſter, to conſider your ſtate and prepare to improve it? and did not theſe circumſtances create a *neceſſity* of taxing the colonies? As to their conſent, it never had been aſked in former acts of taxation. Could the legiſlature imagine the conſent of the Americans neceſſary to form a Britiſh ſtatute? Had they deviated into that miſtake, they had ſubverted the conſtitution of this realm, by conſidering the colony aſſemblies as part of the ſupreme legiſlature? Had his majeſty, by his miniſters, made a requiſiton of ſupplies, he had extended his prerogative to a degree of annihilating the parliamentary authority in America; his miniſters had been traitors; and an ignominious death had been the juſt reward of their treachery to the ſtate. Do not theſe circumſtances afford an indiſputable teſtimony of the *right*, *equity*, *policy*, and *neceſſity* of ſuch an act, and an ample

juſti-

juſtification of Mr. *Grenville*'s ſyſtem of raiſing a revenue on the Americans?

But it ſeems the preamble contained theſe remarkable words. "The Commons, &c. being "deſirous to make *ſome* proviſion in the *preſent* "ſeſſion of parliament, *towards* raiſing the ſaid "revenue." And in your repreſentatives, whoſe indiſpenſible duty it is to alleviate the burthen of your taxes; was it not a juſt deſire, which ought to be carried into execution? But can the *deſire* of parliament, to make *ſome* proviſion in the *then* ſeſſion, *towards* raiſing a revenue, authoriſe this ſpeaker to aſſert, "that it appeared to the co-"lonies, that this act was the beginning of ſor-"row; that every ſeſſion was to produce ſomething "of the ſame kind; that the parliament was to "go on from day to day, in charging them with "ſuch taxes as they pleaſed; for ſuch a military "force as they ſhould think proper." And what is there in all this, more than is conſtitutionally done, in this kingdom, every ſeſſion of parliament? And where he tells you, "the execution of the "act was put into military hands," if he mean that the army was to collect the tax, he knows he utters an untruth, with malevolence prepenſe to inflame you againſt the miniſtry. In one moment you ſhall ſee him contradict this behaviour of the Americans and himſelf.

"Had this plan been purſued," ſays he, "it "was evident that the provincial aſſemblies, in "which the Americans felt all their portion of "importance, and beheld their ſole image of "freedom, were *ipſo facto* annihilated." It ſeems probable, that the corporation of London is more ancient than the exiſtence of a houſe of Commons, and there is no certainty when it was firſt inſtituted,

being

being by preſcription antecedent to any ſubſiſting charter. When the parliament took place, as it now exiſts, and the ſupreme legiſlative authority laid duties on the Londoners, were " their por-
" tion of importance and ſole image of freedom
" annihilated ?" Have they and the other incorporated bodies, hitherto conceived that ſuch was the effect of the *parliamentary power* being ſuperior to that of the charteral ? How then could this conſtitutional authority offer " an ill proſpect to the
" Americans that ſeemed boundleſs in extent, and
" endleſs in duration?" He tells you, however, "they
" were not miſtaken." And what are the reaſons he adduces in proof that the proſpect was boundleſs, and endleſs ? It was, becauſe " the miniſtry
" valued themſelves when this act paſſed, and
" when they gave notice of the ſtamp act, that
" both of the duties came very far ſhort of their
" ideas of American taxation." And then, on this proof of the inefficacy of theſe taxes, he adds, great
" was the applauſe of theſe meaſures here." Thus the *miniſtry* valued themſelves and were *applauded* for that in which they had *miſcarried*. "In England, how-
" ever, we cried out for new taxes on America,
" whilſt they cried out they were nearly cruſhed
" with thoſe which the war, and their own grants
" had brought upon them." And from theſe two *outcries*, he has drawn theſe *concluſions*, that " the Americans were *not miſtaken*." That " the American *importance*, and their *ſole image of freedom* were annihilated, and the *proſpect* of being reduced to nothing was become *boundleſs* in *extent*, and *endleſs* in *duration*."

When the mile ſtones were firſt erected on the Oxford road, a village, that had been hitherto reckoned to be *five*, was now found to be *ſeven*

miles from that city. On this an old woman of the village made a lamentable *outcry* againſt the cruelty of the turnpike commiſſioners. For when the road conſiſted but of *five miles*, ſaid ſhe, I could walk very well to Oxford: but now they have made it *ſeven*, I can go no more there. And thus ſhe loſt her *portion* of *importance* and *ſole image of freedom*. I do not infer from hence, that this celebrated ſpeaker reaſons like an old woman; it is only to ſhew, that ſimilar geniuſes do frequently coincide in the manner of forming concluſions from like premiſes.

He now tells you, "it has been ſaid in the de-
"bate, that when the firſt American revenue act
"(the act in 1764 impoſing the port duties)
"paſſed, the Americans did not object to the
"principle; it is true they touched it but very
"gently. It was not a direct attack." And thus this orator, reſtleſs until he hath demoliſhed his own edifice, becomes an evidence againſt himſelf; and amply teſtifies that the very act, which he aſſerts, had given the proſpect, to the Americans, of their importance and their freedom being annihilated, had "paſſed without any objection, to the principle, or with a light touch only." The reaſon is, "they did not conſider it as a direct attack;" and therefore they never could have fancied any ſuch boundleſs proſpect, or eternity of duration, as he mentions. And now, conſiſtent in inconſiſtency alone, he aſſigns the reaſons why they could *not* have had ſuch a proſpect; "they were
"as yet novices; as yet unaccuſtomed to direct
"attacks upon any of the rights of parliament.
"The duties were port duties, like thoſe they had
"been accuſtomed to bear, with this difference,
"that the title was not the ſame, the preamble not

"the

" the ſame, and the ſpirit altogether unlike." And thus having depoſed in contradiction to himſelf, he brings arguments to prove, that with all theſe additional circumſtances, the duties were ſuch as they were accuſtomed to bear; that therefore they had neither a right to object to the law, nor a motive to create that viſionary proſpect which he deſcribes, and that by now *firſt attacking* the *rights* of *parliament*, they began their progreſs to rebellion.

He now aſks, " of what ſervice is this obſerva-
" tion (*that the Americans did not object to the par-*
" *liament authority*) to the cauſe of thoſe that make
" it? it is a full refutation for the pretence of
" their preſent cruelty to America; for it ſhews,
" out of their own mouths, that our colonies were
" backwards to enter into the preſent vexations
" and ruinous controverſy." From hence, it ſhould appear, that the miniſtry have made the *acquieſcence* of the Americans with the act of 1764, a *pretence* for their preſent cruelty, as he calls it. Otherwiſe how can that conduct, in the coloniſts, be a refutation of that pretence? but is that the caſe? and when it ſhews out of the miniſtry's own mouths, that the colonies were backwards to enter into the preſent controverſy, does it not ſhew alſo, out of the orator's, when they reſiſt what they had *never* before *objected to*, that they rebelled againſt their own convictions. And therefore they ought to be compelled to obey that parliamentary authority, which antecedently they never had oppoſed, and now preſume *directly to attack?*

He advances with equal ſucceſs in the ſubſequent affirmation. " There is alſo another cir-
" culation abroad (ſpread with a malignant in-
" tention, which he cannot attribute to thoſe who

" ſay the ſame thing in the houſe) that Mr. Gren-
" ville gave the colony agents an option for their
" aſſemblies to tax themſelves, which they had
" refuſed. He finds much ſtreſs is laid on this as
" a fact. However, it happens neither to be true
" nor poſſible." I ſhall confront this hardy aſ-
ſertion by an evidence not to be refuted. It was printed in the London Evening Poſt, Feb. 28, and ſubſcribed *Iſrael Mauduit*.

" In the beginning of March 1764, a number
" of reſolutions, relative to the plantation trade,
" were propoſed by Mr. Grenville, and paſſed in
" the houſe of commons.—The fifteenth of theſe
" was, that towards the further defraying the
" ſaid expences, it may be proper to charge cer-
" tain ſtamp duties on the ſaid colonies and plan-
" tations. The other reſolutions were formed into
" the plantation act, and the fifteenth was put
" off till the next ſeſſion, Mr. Grenville declaring
" that he was willing to give time to the colonies
" to conſider of it, and to make their option of
" raiſing that or ſome other tax. The agents
" waited ſeparately on Mr. Grenville upon this
" matter, and wrote to their ſeveral colonies. At
" the end of the ſeſſion, we went to him, all of
" us together, to know if he ſtill intended to bring
" in ſuch a bill; he anſwered, he did; and then
" repeated to us, in form, what I had heard
" him ſay before in private; and in the houſe of
" commons; that the late war had found us ſeventy
" millions, and left us more than one hundred
" and forty millions in debt. He knew that all
" men wiſhed not to be taxed; but that in theſe
" unhappy circumſtances, it was his duty, as a
" ſteward for the public, to make uſe of every
" juſt means of improving the public revenue:

" that

" that he never meant, however, to charge the " colonies with any part of the intereſt of the " national debt. But beſides that public debt, " the nation had incurred a great annual expence " in the maintaining of the ſeveral new conqueſts, " which we had made during the war, and by " which the colonies were ſo much benefited. " That the American civil and military eſtabliſh- " ment, after the peace of Aix la Chapelle, was " only 70,000*l.* per annum. It was now encreaſed " to 350,000*l.* This was a great additional ex- " pence incurred upon an American account: " and he thought, therefore, that America ought " to contribute towards it. He did not expect " that the colonies ſhould raiſe the whole, but " ſome part of it he thought they ought to raiſe, " and this ſtamp-act was intended for that pur- " poſe."

" That he judged this method of raiſing the " money the eaſieſt and moſt equitable; that it " was a tax which would fall only upon property; " would be collected by the feweſt officers; and " would be equally ſpread over America and the " Weſt-Indies; ſo that all would bear their ſhare " of the public burthen.

" He then went on, I am not however ſet upon " this tax; if the Americans diſlike it, and pre- " fer any other method of raiſing the money " themſelves, I ſhall be content. Write therefore " to your ſeveral colonies, and if they chuſe any " other mode, I ſhall be ſatisfied, provided the " money be but raiſed."

This converſation was tranſmitted to the colonies, by their agents, to which they received the follow- ing anſwers.

Boſton, June 14, 1754.

" Sir,

" The houſe of repreſentatives have received " your ſeveral letters, &c. The actual laying the " ſtamp duty, you ſay, is deferred till next year, " Mr. Grenville being willing to give the pro- " vinces their option to raiſe that, or ſome other " equivalent tax, deſirous, as he was pleaſed to " expreſs himſelf, to conſult the eaſe and quiet, " and the good will of the colonies.——If the " eaſe, the quiet, and the good will of the co- " lonies are of any importance to Great Britain, " no meaſure could be hit upon that hath a more " natural and direct tendency to enervate thoſe " principles, than the reſolutions you encloſed. " The kind offer of ſuſpending this ſtamp duty " in the manner, and upon the condition you " mention, amounts to no more than this: that " if the colonies will not tax themſelves, as they " may be directed, the parliament will tax them. " ——You are to remonſtrate againſt theſe mea- " ſures, and, if poſſible, to obtain a repeal of " the ſugar act, and prevent the impoſition of " any further duties or taxes on the colonies; " meaſures will be taken that you may be joined " by all the other agents."

From hence it is evident, that Mr. Grenville did indiſputably propoſe to the colonies the raiſing of a duty adequate to the purpoſe of the ſtamp-act; and that theſe refractory coloniſts did poſitively refuſe to accept that offer. Thus it is demonſtrated, that what this accurate orator pronounces to be neither *true* nor *poſſible*, are *real facts*. After this I ſhall not trouble you with refuting the reaſons which he brings to prove, that what did

certainly

certainly exiſt, had no *exiſtence*. It is true, that the act of 1764 is, in your orator's account, ſo blended with that of the ſtamp-act of 1765, that it looks as if he had mixed them in this manner from a conſciouſneſs of being open to immediate confutation without that artifice; and by theſe means that he intended to eſcape detection, like the ink fiſh, which blackens the waters, and renders the ſpot, in which he lies, inviſible to his purſuers. Even the letter of governor Bernard, which he quotes, muſt have convinced him, that the preceding propoſal of Mr. Grenville was relative to the ſtamp-act only; but as he adduces this tranſcript as a proof, that the Americans, burthened as they were, were not then taxable; as it comes from a reſpectable authority, it merits your conſideration.

" The American governments had, in the pro-
" ſecution of the late war, contracted very large
" debts, which it will take ſome years to pay off,
" and in the mean time occaſion very burdenſome
" taxes for that ſupport only; for inſtance, this
" government (the Maſſachuſets) which is as much
" before-hand as any, raiſes every year 37,500*l.*
" ſterling, for ſinking their debt, and muſt con-
" tinue it for four years longer at leaſt, before it
" will be clear."

This inability founded on their debts, incurred in the laſt war, which concluded with *happineſs*, *ſecurity*, and *opulence* to them, is an argument, than which nothing can be more inconcluſive. In this war undertaken for theſe Americans, this colony ran in debt 150,000*l.* which they can diſcharge in *four years*; and you, of this kingdom, for their defence, incurred a debt of 70,000,000*l.* for the liquidation of which, the duration of the world will not allow a time ſufficient. The intereſt of

that immenſe ſum, you, your children, and all ſucceeding generations, are mortgaged to pay, by the ſweat of your brows; whilſt theſe traiterous Americans, wantoning in eaſe and opulence, refuſe to contribute to the payment of thoſe taxes which are requiſite for the ſupport of their own governments! Such is the object of their rebellious oppoſition. Such is the boon, which this orator, and their abettors are labouring to obtain for them! and under the deceitful maſk of *patriotiſm*, to *annihilate* the ſupreme *rights* of their *own* country, and by the *ſound* of *liberty* to oblige you inceſſantly to toil as *ſlaves* for traitors. It is their intereſt, their ambition, their luſt of power, their private ends, to which *theſe patriots* tend, under the oſtentatious pretext of *public virtue*. And now in the words of your orator, I ſhall ſay, "thus I have "diſpoſed of this falſehood;" but as he tells you, "falſehood has a perennial ſpring," I will, therefore, purſue him through the remainder of his ſpeech, and ſtick to him like deſperation to a nabob's conſcience.

He now tells you, "it is ſaid, that no conjecture "could be made of the diſlike of the coloniſts "to the principle. This is as untrue as the "other." It is preciſely in the ſame predicament, and you ſhall have the proof from himſelf; the *principle* is the *legiſlative authority*, and to *that authority*, reſpecting the act of 1764, he has already told you the Americans did not object. Whence then could the conjecture ariſe, that they would oppoſe that *principle* in the *next* year, the *right* of which they had *acknowledged* in the *former?* but there is no neceſſity of receding to his paſt ſayings for a confutation of himſelf. The paſſage which immediately follows is adequate to that end.

"After

" After the reſolution of the houſe," ſays he, "and " before the paſſing of the ſtamp-act, the colonies " of the Maſſachuſet's Bay and New York did " ſend remonſtrances, objecting to this *mode* of " parliamentary taxation." And thus he concludes, that the *principle*, the *legiſlative authority*, is the ſame with the *laws* it makes, or the *mode* of taxation; and therefore becauſe the Americans diſliked the thing *created*, they objected to the *creator* alſo. Thus an *averſion* from a *toad* is a *diſlike* to the *deity*.

He then aſks, " what was the conſequence? " The remonſtrances were ſuppreſſed, they were " put under the table, notwithſtanding an order " of council to the contray, by the miniſtry which " compoſed the very council that had made the " order; and thus the houſe proceeded to its buſi- " neſs of taxing, without the leaſt regular know- " ledge of the objections which were made to it." Which is, if I underſtand this paſſage, that the houſe of Commons ordered theſe remonſtrances to be put under the table, notwithſtanding an order of council to keep them above board. A right which the Commons ought to exert in oppoſition to all *orders* of *council*. But the true reaſon was, that when the houſe was acquainted with the true diſpoſition of the Americans, by their agents, and their own letters; and that they were determined not to obey the parliamentary authority, they acted as a Britiſh ſenate, and every legiſlative authority ought to act. They would not permit the ſovereignty of the realm to become a ſubject of debate, or called in queſtion. Such a proceeding would have pronounced them to be traitors to their truſt and to the ſtate; beſides the eternal objection of being judges in their own cauſe. They therefore rightly

proceed

proceed to the buſineſs of taxing the Americans in contempt of every objection, and the ſtamp act was paſſed.

" This," ſays he, "was the ſtate of the colonies, " before his majeſty thought fit to change his mini- " ſtry; it ſtands upon *no* authority of his." Indeed he has no authority for what he has ſaid, and conſequently the whole has no foundation, as it has been fully proved by incontrovertible records. " Mr. " Cornwall," he ſays, " has deſired ſome of them " to lay their hands upon their hearts, and anſwer " to his queries upon the hiſtorical part of this " conſideration, and by his manner he ſeemed to " addreſs himſelf to him. He will anſwer him " with great openneſs; he has nothing to conceal." By thus aſſuming to *himſelf* this addreſs of Mr. Cornwall to *ſome* of them, would you not imagine that he had been chancellor of the Exchequer, or leader of miniſterial buſineſs in the houſe, during the Rockingham adminiſtration, whoſe uprightneſs had nothing to fear or to conceal? But you ſhall hear what he ſays of himſelf, with an account of whom he begins the hiſtorical part of this conſideration, like *the memoirs of P. P. clerk of this pariſh.* " In the year ſixty-five, being in a private " ſtation, far enough from any line of buſineſs, " and not having the honour of a ſeat in this houſe, " it was my fortune," ſays he, " unknowing and " unkown to the then miniſtry, by the interven- " tion of a common friend, to become connected " with a very noble perſon, and at the head of the " Treaſury department." Fortunate to *him*, but fatal to his *friend.* The deed hung heavy on his ſoul. He——but I will proceed no further in the relation of an event, by which we loſt a man,

whoſe

whoſe ſenſations were too delicate to bear the diſappointments of miſtaken friendſhip.

" It was," he adds, " indeed in a ſituation of " little rank, and no conſequence, ſuitable to the " mediocrity of my talents and pretenſions." It was indeed in that of being private ſecretary to Lord Rockingham. But ſince he ſo humbly ſpeaks of his *mediocrity* of *talents*, *his little rank*, and his *no conſequence*, how comes it to paſs, that he thought Mr. Cornwall addreſſed himſelf to him? He tells you indeed, " it was only as well as his eyes could " diſcern it." From his own words you ſhall derive the true reaſon. " But a ſituation near " enough," ſays he, " to ſee as well as others " what was going on." And hence it reſults, as men *muſt* always *ſee what is going on* in proportion to their *powers* of *diſcernment*, that he *pretends* to poſſeſs an underſtanding equal to the miniſter himſelf, or any of his coadjutors; or that the miniſter ſaw things according to the *mediocrity* of his ſecretary's talents. That the former was the *pretenſion* of your orator is evident beyond diſpute; for ſays he, " I *did ſee* in " that noble perſon ſuch ſound principles; ſuch " an enlargement of mind; ſuch clear and ſaga- " cious ſenſe, and ſuch an unſhaken fortitude, as " have bound me, as well as others much better " than me, by an invincible attachment to him " from that forward." Thus you find, as he could ſee as well as others, what was going on, and this miniſter was *one* of the *things* which was going on, he muſt, logically, include all the great qualities of his maſter; or how could he have ſeen things ſo well as *he* did? And hence you muſt perceive that the *badneſs* of his *eyes*, being unable to extend their views to the end of his vanity; it was

by

by the influence of the latter that he appropriated Mr. Cornwall's addreſs to himſelf alone.

As to his *attachment* to the noble lord, I harbour no doubt, that it is as firm as that of the ivy to the wall, and for the ſame reaſon, that of being *ſupported*. You all know it is impoſſible for *one man* to determine what *another* ſees; and therefore I can neither affirm nor deny, that Mr. Burke ſaw thoſe amazing qualities in the then firſt lord of the Treaſury. I ſhall take the liberty of hinting only, that as this orator *hears* what does *not* ſound to other *ears*, ſo he may ſee what is *inviſible* to the diſcernment of other mens *eyes*. I ſhall, however, examine the conduct of *that* miniſter as freely as *his* ſecretary has enquired into thoſe of other miniſters; and then leave it to your determination, whether theſe ſuperlative qualities are become viſible to you.

I paſs the conduct of Lord Rockingham, reſpecting the Spaniſh trade of America, becauſe Mr. Burke "believes he ſoon ſaw his way in that "buſineſs." For he was his *guide*, *philoſopher*, and *friend*. And "the alarm which was taken by the "whole body in office, when his lordſhip began to "open his ground." Becauſe thoſe hoſtile preparations produced nothing to the preſent purpoſe. "The firſt ſtep the noble lord took, was to have "the opinion of his excellent, learned, and *ever-*"*lamented* friend the late Mr. York," more particularly as he deſerted him for the ſeals. "When his "lordſhip knew that formally and officially, which "in ſubſtance he had known before," from Mr. Burke, whoſe *maſculine underſtanding* had been *quickened* by the ſcience of the law, which makes *more* knaves than all the others upon earth. "He immediately diſpatched orders to "redreſs the grievance," reſpecting the Spaniſh trade.

trade. And Mr. Burke will ſay,—— *willful* will do it. " For the then miniſter, he is of that conſti-
" tution of mind, that he knows he would have
" iſſued, on the ſame critical occaſion, the very
" ſame orders, if the acts of trade had been, as
" they were not, directly againſt him; and would
" have chearfully ſubmitted to the equity of par-
" liament for his indemnity."

Now it appears to me, that this panegyriſt of Lord Rockingham, would have acted, to the full, as judiciouſly, if he had ſaid nothing of this noble lord's *conſtitution of mind.* Becauſe ſo prevalent a *diſpoſition* to act againſt law, on his *own* authority, does not ſeem to be the beſt adapted for being entruſted with the executive powers of a free ſtate. And I would willingly believe, that the ſecretary has diſcerned *no* ſuch conſtitution in his maſter. For it can never be a characteriſtic that will recommend him to his *ſovereign*; or which ought to be eſteemed by you the *ſubjects.* Beſides this, his lordſhip does, I imagine, remember, that a king was once driven from the throne of this realm, for *diſpenſing* with the *laws*; and that the *bill* of *rights* pronounces ſuch acts *illegal*, even in a *ſovereign.* Can a *miniſter*, with prudence, therefore rely on the *indemnity* of parliament for ſuch tranſgreſſions as have baniſhed kings? Beſides this, does he not recollect, that an illuſtrious anceſtor, than whom no mortal ever had a more illuſtrious, died on the ſcaffold, for ſuch tranſactions as the laws could make *no crime*; although the blood-thirſty, and rebellious progenitors of thoſe very fanatics, whoſe unnatural cauſe his lordſhip now ſupports, doomed him moſt murderouſly to death. Awake, my lord, awake, fly from your deluders; return to the glorious and the virtuous

principles

principles of the great earl of Stafford; your king, your country, your noble lineage, every laudable ſenſation of humanity invoke you to it. Shall a *Wentworth* join with the abettors of rebellion, and plead the cauſe of men deſcended from thoſe who put his guiltleſs anceſtor to death, and whoſe principles would now doom him to a like fate?

Your orator continues. "It was not till the "end of October that the news of the troubles, "on account of the ſtamp act, arrived in Eng- "land. No ſooner had the ſound of that mighty "tempeſt reached us in England, than the whole "of the then oppoſition, inſtead of feeling hum- "bled by the unhappy iſſue of their meaſures, "ſeemed to be infinitely elated, and cried out, "that the miniſtry, from envy to the glory of "their predeceſſors, were prepared to repeal the "ſtamp act."

As "this *ſeeming to be infinitely elated*, at the *unhappy* iſſue of their *own* meaſures; and that this *elation* ſhould produce an outcry, that the miniſtry, from *envy* to the *glory* of their predeceſſors, were prepared to repeal the ſtamp act," appears to be extremely *unnatural*, I ſhall preſume to aſſign another motive to this moral phænomenon. When this preceeding news arrived, the then oppoſition were not *elated* on the late *unhappy* iſſue of their *own* meaſures, but on that of the then miniſtry, who, when in oppoſition, by their harangues on the illegality of internally taxing the Americans, had filled their heads with falacious notions, and their hearts with the traiterous reſolutions of reſiſting the legiſlative authority. The oppoſition ſaw the new minſtry caught in their own toils, and inſtead of envying them the glory of the repeal, were *elated*; for ſuch is the nature of man, that this mighty *tempeſt* had reached your ſhores, by which

which they muſt be wrecked in the repeal of the ſtamp act, caſt on ſhore and ſtripped of power, place, intereſt, and eſteem. That the event will juſtify this manner of thinking, cannot be well called in queſtion. And this, I imagine, will offer a better reaſon for this *joy* of oppoſition, than the *unhappy* iſſue of their *own* meaſures; for misfortunes are ſeldom accompanied with *pleaſure.*

Your orator perſiſts. " I do," ſays he, " put " my hand upon my heart, and aſſure them, that " they did *not* come to a reſolution directly to re- " peal. They weighed this matter as its diffi- " culty and importance required. They con- " ſidered maturely among themſelves. They " conſidered with all who could give advice or in- " formation. It was not determined but a little " before the meeting of parliament. But it was " determined, and the main lines of their own " plan marked out before that meeting. Two " queſtions aroſe, (I hope I am not going into a " narrative troubleſome to the houſe.) *

" [A cry of, go on, go on.]"

Oh, vanity, how ſtupendous is thy power on the heart of man! This orator of *too ſcrupulous a delicacy*, inſerts in his printed ſpeech, that which, he imagines, was an oblation of applauſe at the altar of his pre-eminence.

Before I proceed to a farther examination of the conduct of the Rockingham miniſtry, it is abſolutely requiſite that I lay before you of what this American tempeſt conſiſted. And that no intent to

* Bathos. chap. 10. Apoſiopeſis.

to delude you by misrepresentation may be imputed to me, I will give it in your orator's own words. " The resolutions of the assemblies were " violent; the insurrections universal; the stamp " papers were seized and burned; the stamp of- " ficers forced to resign their commissions under " the gallows; the houses of the magistrates were " rifled and pulled down; they expelled from the " country all who dared to write or speak a single " word in defence of the powers of parliament.*

Such were the horrors that characterised this American tempest, and never were a captain and a crew so astonished and struck with terror, as the new minister and his associates, who had undertaken the conduct of the political ship. They were all in the state of Scapin's master, each asking, *what the devil had he to do on ship-board?*

Conviction came too late. They saw that their speeches, in opposition to the parliamentary authority of taxing America, had produced not only a determined disobedience to the right of imposing *internal* but *external* taxes also; and they feared that nothing less than an absolute renunciation of the legislative authority of this realm over the colonies could calm this tempest in America. This horrible apparition was accompanied with another not less terrifying; a dread that the renouncing of the sovereign legislative right would not only expose them to utter detestation and contempt in Britain, and in all the nations of the earth, but that such a pusillanimity of conduct must speedily dismiss them from power and office, if they disregarded the late resolution of the commons, *firmly* and *effectually* to support his majesty to

* Speech, p. 71.

to ſuppreſs thoſe rebellious inſurrections. At the ſame time, without yielding to the demands, which they, in their harangues, had ſo ſtrenuouſly pronounced to be the rights of the colonies, they knew not how to extricate themſelves from their embarraſsments on that ſide. Thus, like rats, ſeduced, by the love of bacon, into a wire-trap, the new miniſtry found themſelves unable to get *out*, or to ſtay *in* with ſafety. No terms can more aptly expreſs their terrible perplexity, than thoſe which your orator hath offered in their juſtification.

" The firſt of the two conſiderations, ſays he, " was whether the repeal ſhould be total, or " whether only partial, taking out every thing " burthenſome and productive, and reſerving only " an empty acknowledgement, ſuch as a *ſtamp* on " cards or dice." Hence it appears, that the firſt conſideration of thoſe new ſtateſmen, who had oppoſed the *ſtamp-act* as illegal, was to *prove*, they had acted *againſt* their *conſciences*, by keeping a ſtamp-act ſtill exiſting. But this they ſoon perceived would not ſucceed. Conſcience had no buſineſs to interfere in that affair. Thus their own profeſſions, purſuits, and pretended principles, that the parliament had no right to tax America, being unrepreſented, ſerved them as the wires ſerved the rats. They had let them in, but on attempting to get out, they ran in their faces, and made them too ſore for further attempts of eſcaping that way. For this *empty* acknowledgement of a parliamentary right to lay a ſtamp duty on cards or dice, like the orator's *empty recital*, would have been brimful of ruin to their continuance in the miniſtry. As all mankind would have then ſeen their abandoned conduct, in having oppoſed that very

right and that very tax which they would now exert and continue exactly in the same manner which they condemned. Such a transaction would have rendered them not only detested as men void of principle; but ridiculous as divested of common understanding. Yet even that intention, so demonstrative of their injustice, in opposing Mr. Grenville; so replete with the exhibition of their own folly by its having been once in meditation; and so needless to be revealed at present, hath the wisdom of your responsible orator laid before the commons in *sounds*, and your in *print!* Is it not probable that, from a persuasion, that such *derogating discoveries* would proceed from his attempting to *justify* himself and his master, that the cry of *go on, go on*, arose, which he attributes to the *approbation* of his auditors.

" The other question, he adds, was on what " principle the act should be repealed." Hence it is clear, that these ministers, when in opposition, had opposed this act on *no principle*. For had they acted on *principle*, that on which it was *opposed* would have *equally* served for its being *repealed*. However, " on the head of this principle two " principles were started." This starting of *two* principles upon the *head* of *one* principle is a happy imitation of his favourite authority.* One of these was, " that the legislative rights of this " country, with regard to America, were not " entire, but had certain restrictions and limitati- " ons." This, although it were the chief argument on which, in opposition, they had exploded the parliamentary right of taxing America, they were withheld from carrying into execution. And does

* Bathos. chap. 10. Of the variegating, confounding, and reversing figures.

does not that circumſtance fully evince that their former arguments, and their conſciences had been conſtantly at war; or that their fortitude was unequal to the demands to which thoſe declarations had reduced them? This diſcovery ſhews you alſo that your orator is undeſignedly battering the place he would defend.

" The other principle was, that taxes of this " kind were contrary to the fundamental princi- " ples of commerce, on which the colonies were " founded; and contrary to every idea of poli- " tical equity; by which equity we are bound as " much as poſſible to extend the ſpirit and benefit " of the Britiſh conſtitution to every part of the " Britiſh dominions." But on what ground is this principle ſupported? is the peremptory averment of this orator ſufficient to obtain it credit? the experience of all ages contradicts this opinion. For, in what ſtate, either ancient or modern, founded on commercial principles, was there no internal taxation? was ſuch the caſe at Tyre, Carthage, Athens, or any other commercial realm of antiquity? is it ſo, at this day, in Venice, Genoa, or Holland?

The conſtitution of England indeed was not founded on commercial principles. Yet ſo much of theſe principles hath been woven into its original fabric ſince its commencement, that it may, not improperly, be deemed a commercial government. And ſuch is the fact, that *internal taxes* have been multiplied with the *augmentation* of her *trade*. That trade alone hath ſupplied the means of payment. And by that trade the nation hath been amazingly enriched. This being the ſpirit of the Britiſh conſtitution, whence does it ariſe that it is contrary to every idea of *political equity*, to proceed in a ſimilar mode in America? as

this ſpeaker affirms, "we are bound, as much as poſſible, by that *equity*, to extend the *ſpirit* and the *benefit* of the Britiſh conſtitution to every part of the Britiſh dominions." And thus, in compliance with his own precepts, he and his miniſter *extended* the ſpirit of the Britiſh conſtitution into America, by *abrogating* a law which was made in conformity to the undeviating practice of that very *conſtitution?*

He continues, "the option both of the meaſure, "and of the principle of the repeal was made be- "fore the ſeſſion; and I wonder, ſays he, how "any one can read the king's ſpeech, at the open- "ing of that ſeſſion, without ſeeing in that ſpeech, "both the repeal and the declaratory act very ſuf- "ficiently crayoned out. Thoſe who cannot "ſee this can ſee nothing." It was under that *miniſtry alone*, that in the ſpeech from the throne, the parliament hath been informed what laws they were to repeal, and what to ſupport. Was it not an *invaſion* on the rights of the ſubjects by which thoſe miniſters were guilty of high crimes and miſdemeanour? and yet it is avowed by Edmund Burke, *then clerk* to lord Rockingham, who *now* preſents himſelf, in this defence, as the chief and *reſponſible miniſter* of *ſtate*. But as theſe two acts were only *crayoned* out in ſketches, and probably by *himſelf*, it ſo happened that the uſual unintelligibility of his deſigns accompanied them. And thus the meaning of them was fortunately concealed from all but *himſelf* and his *diſciples*.

"A partial repeal," ſays he, "or as the *bon ton* "of the court then was, a *modification*, would "have ſatisfied a timid, unſyſtematic, procraſti- "nating miniſtry, as ſuch a meaſure has ſince done

"ſuch

" ſuch a miniſtry." It ſeems probable that an aſſertion ſo confident, till that moment, had never been uttered in the face of men, who ſtood convinced that the ſhort duration of that feeble miniſtry conſiſted ſolely of timidity, want of ſyſtem, and procraſtination. This you ſhall ſee indiſputably evinced. And then the compariſon of their conduct, and that of the preſent miniſtry ſhall falſify the latter aſſertion, and prove that "the very modification which is the con-" ſtant reſource of weak undeceiving minds," was that which attended the Rockingham adminiſtration in this affair.

" To repeal," ſays he, " by a denial of our " right to tax, in the preamble (and this too did " not want adviſers) would have cut, in the he-" roic ſtile, the Gordion knot with a ſword." A *ſword* compoſed of a majority of votes in the houſe of commons. " Either meaſure, he con-" tinues, would have coſt no more than a day's " debate." What an execrable idea of the ſovereign legiſlative authority of this kingdom does that audacious aſſertion impart. The *king*, the *lords*, the *commons* would have reſcinded the lawful power of the realm; and the rights of the people; and have abſolutely ſubverted this conſtitution, had lord Rockingham thought it proper. It is an aſſertion ſuch as hath never been pronounced by the lips of any man, antecedent to this ſpeech. It is an aſſertion ſo replete with indignity to the *peers*, and your *repreſentatives*, that nothing but a ſettled contempt for him that ſpoke it, could have permitted its paſſing with impunity. It is an imputation of abandoned profligacy, carried up even to the *throne* itſelf; when at no time, ſince the ſun hath riſen on this kingdom, did the diadem ſurround the head of any ſovereign who leſs deſerved

ſo impious an outrage on his character. His ſteadineſs and zeal to ſuſtain the legiſlative authority through all his dominions, even when the Americans are taking arms to place his prerogative ſuperior to that power, pronounce the preceding paſſage, of this orator, to be a calumny unprecedented in the hiſtory of the world, and in the malevolence of man.

He perſiſts. "But when the total repeal was "adopted; and adopted on principles of po-"licy, of equity, and of commerce; this plan "made it neceſſary to enter into many and diffi-"cult meaſures." Of their principles of policy, equity, and commerce, I have already ſpoken. It ſhall ſoon be confirmed by their own conduct in getting out of their difficulties, of what they conſiſted. And now I will regale you with a paſſage, that excels, in the Babyloniſh jargon of unintelligible metaphor, all that has hitherto appeared, either in ſpeech or writing.

"It became neceſſary," ſays he, "to open a "very large *field* of *evidence*, *commenſurate to* theſe "extenſive *views*; but then this *labour* did *knights* "*ſervice*. It opened the *eyes* of ſeveral to the "true ſtate of the American affairs: it *enlarged* "their *ideas*; it *removed prejudices*; and it *conciliated* the *opinions* and *affections* of men." This figure, ſo replete with impracticable and incongruous imagery, is taken from his idea of the old feudal government of this realm. The *villains*, or *ſlaves*, whoſe buſineſs it was to drudge in huſbandry, *opened* a very large *field*. You have heard of *a field* of *corn*, *a field* of *hay*, *a field* of *paſture*, and *a field* of *battle*; but when was a *field of evidence* ever opened before the 19*th April*, 1774. This *field*, however, ſo *neceſſary* for *evidence*, was not for the at-

attainment of *truth* and *knowledge* from the teſtimonies to be brought before the parliament. It was to give the miniſtry a *fine proſpect*, commenſurate to their *extenſive views*, which ſeems to be an odd buſineſs for *evidence*. But then this *labour* of *ſlaves* and *villains*, did *knights ſervice*. And thus their *hedging* and *ditching*, and *opening* of *fields*, was the *ſervice* of *freemen*; the *attending* of their *ſovereign* and their *lords in arms*, and at their *courts?* This being ſo ſtrange an innovation, one would imagine it might have ſufficed for any man. But a genius of ſuch magnitude as is your orator, is not to be contented with being *his own parallel*, he will *excel himſelf*. And therefore this *villains knights ſervice*, did not conſiſt in *opening* of fields, nor in *bearing* arms, but in *opening* of *eyes*; and thus it did the ſervice of an *oculiſt*. It ſtopped not there. It *enlarged ideas*, and thus it did the ſervice of *learning*. It removed *prejudices*, and thus it did the ſervice of *philoſophy*. It *conciliated* mens *opinions*, and thereby ſerved as a *peace-maker*. Hence it appears that the miniſter was a *villain*, a *knight*, an *oculiſt*, a *preceptor*, a *philoſopher*, and a *juſtice* of the *peace*, all at one time, and on the ſame buſineſs. With what luxuriant exhibition of the *profund*, are your minds regaled! * Imitated from thoſe paſſages, where the Almighty is repreſented as a *mercer*, a *baker*, a *butler*, a *goldbeater*, a *fuller*, &c. But the preceding profundities in the bathos were ſelected from a variety of paſſages in ſeveral books. In this unparalleled ſpeech of this clebrated author, they ſtand like ſoldiers in a line, with each a *different uniform*.

* Ch. 5. of the true genius for the profund, and by what it is conſtituted.

It would, however, be a flagrant injuſtice to deny, that the nimbleneſs of his imagination, in leaping from one object to another, is prodigious. The great Socrates is repreſented as being an admirer of agility, and to meaſure the leaps of that wonder of agility a flea. I would therefore hope, that this *great* orator will not be offended at my comparing his *nimble* fancy with that minute exiſtence. I confeſs, however, the *former never ſtings*. They both leap from ſpot to ſpot, in ſuch directions as expreſs no intent of proceeding to any particular end. They are inviſible in their paſſage from place to place. At every pauſe you are conſtantly ſurprized to ſee them, where they were never expected: until at length they both diſappear, by ſpringing, the Lord knows whither.

Such being the numerous employments in which the miniſter was then engaged. He tells you, " the noble Lord Rockingham, who then took " the *lead in* adminiſtration." Your orator ſtill going *before* him, like the mace-bearer preceding the ſpeaker of the Commons, to expreſs his dignity and direct the way. " His honoured friend " under him, Mr. Dowdeſwell; and a right hon. " gentleman, general Conway (if he will not re- " ject his ſhare, and it was a large one in his " buſineſs) exerted the moſt laudable indu- " ſtry, in bringing before the houſe the fulleſt, " moſt important, and leaſt *garbled body* of evi- " dence that were ever produced to that houſe." To *garble* a *parcel* of evidence, may be allowable in figure; but the *brokers* declare, a *body* is *not* to be *garbled*, either in *fact* or *figure*.

He now tells you, " the enquiry," which included all the preceding ſervices, " laſted in the " com-

" committee for ſix weeks ; and at its concluſion " this houſe, by an independent, noble, ſpirited, " and unexpected majority ; by a majority that " will redeem all the acts ever done by majorities " in parliament." Will it redeem the riot act, the ſeptennial act, the acts that have mortgaged your anceſtors and yourſelves, and will continue the ſame burthen on your poſterity for the payment of the intereſt of thoſe millions which were raiſed in ſupport of Dutchmen and Germans in former wars, and of the Americans in the laſt? If the miſchief of all theſe, and a number of other acts be redeemed, by repealing this ſtamp act, on what account do the miniſtry proceed, as if theſe ſtatutes were ſtill in full energy? why do you pay theſe *taxes*, which are *redeemed* by parliament? why is the miniſter unimpeached that ſtill dares to collect them? Otherwiſe is it not a *redemption*, where *nothing* is *redeemed*? An impoſition on your underſtandings attempted by this orator, who thus preſumes to treat you as an undiſcerning populace? But whence did this ſudden transformation ariſe, of being independent, noble, and ſpirited in this majority, who you are told, in this very page, of his oration, were ready to have *denied* the Britiſh right of taxing the Americans? This readineſs, and that which would have been the effect of its being employed, may probably be deemed, an act of a noble and ſpirited majority, by this orator. But were there no *dependent* members who contributed to that majority? Could it have been *unexpected*, by *him*, when he has already declared, they were *ſure* that it would have coſt but a day's debate to renounce the Britiſh authority over America? He is eternally combating his own aſſertions,

tions, like a cock that fights with his own image in a glaſs, unknowing that it is himſelf. Could but this propitiatory act of redemption, extend its influence to the other world, what a multitude of members would then aſcend from the depths of Erebus, to dwell in the celeſtial manſions!

" However, this act of redemption was accom-
" pliſhed in the teeth of all the old mercenary
" Swiſs of ſtate; in deſpite of all the ſpeculators
" and augurs of political events; in defiance of
" the whole embattled legion of veteran penſi-
" oners, and practiſed inſtruments of court, gave
" a total repeal to the ſtamp act; and (if it had
" been ſo permitted) a laſting peace to this
" whole empire." It will be no eaſy taſk to diſcover a paſſage *more* replete with the ſpirit of malignancy, and with *leſs* of the ſpirit of truth and ſatire. His arrows are altogether pointleſs, and even his bolts do not bruiſe, although they be ſoon ſhot. The whole is a venomous parody of that language, which is ſo ſucceſsfully practiſed by the ladies, who, for their amuſement, traffic in fiſh. By the Swiſs of ſtate, I imagine he means ſtate Swiſs. And on this occaſion, the *old* and mercenary were ſupplied by the *new* and mercenary, who oppoſed *their* teeth to *thoſe* of the *others*; few of whom did not paſs into the ſame ſervice under the new leader. Even the deſpite of ſpeculators and augurs in political events, was oppoſed by a like motive in like men; and a *new* legion of *new* penſioners, in which moſt of the *old* inliſted, was embattled on this occaſion of repealing the ſtamp act. For by what other than mercenary means, was a majority obtained in all that parliament? It is true indeed, that the repeal of the ſtamp act would have given as laſting a peace

to

the empire of this kingdom over America, as ſevering the head of Charles the firſt with an axe, did to his ſovereignty over this kingdom. But in political diſeaſes, death is ſometimes but apparent, and there the means of recovering ſubſiſts. Such was happily the caſe in this inſtance.

" I ſtate," ſays your orator, " theſe particulars, " becauſe this act of ſpirit and fortitude, has lately " been, in the circulation of the ſeaſon, and in " ſome hazarded declamations in this houſe, attri- " buted to timidity. If the conduct of miniſtry, " in propoſing the repeal, had ariſen from timi- " dity, with regard to themſelves, it would have " been greatly to be condemned. Intereſted ti- " midity diſgraces as much in the cabinet, as per- " ſonal timidity does in the field. But timidity, " with regard to the well-being of our country, " is heroic virtue." By the *circulation* of the ſeaſon, for ſurely no ſeaſon *circulates*, I imagine he means the *progreſſion* of it. It is his *preſcriptive* right, in *words*, to bend the inflexible ſtraight lines of nature into circles, but never to make the crooked paths ſtraight. I will examine this idea of timidity, which your orator has delivered. "Intereſted timidity he allows, diſgraces as much in the cabinet, as perſonal timidity does in the field; but *timidity*, with regard to the *well-being* of our *country*, is *heroic virtue*." Hence it follow, that the miniſter, who *trembles* with *fear*, when the *well-being* of his *country* calls him forth to arduous action, is a *man* both *virtuous* and *heroic*. Is it not an opinion, hitherto unavowed, that timidity, reſpecting the welfare of your country, is virtuous, which it is the indiſpenſible duty of every ſubject to promote and to defend, a welfare which exceeds that of perſon in degree, as millions are more

more in number than an individual; a welfare which can never be deſerted by a miniſter but through a flagitious inſenſibility of honour; a renunciation of every claim to fortitude; a dereliction of his duty to exert that executive power with which he is entruſted! all which diſgrace the very being of humanity: and yet a timidity which includes all theſe your orator hath dared to dignify with the name of *heroic virtue.*

On this opinion of heroic and virtuous timidity, ſo irreconcileable with every conception of magnanimity, it was, that this ſecretary and his maſter founded their conduct, reſpecting the welfare of your country in repealing the ſtamp act. And this he verifies, by avowing, " the noble lord who " then conducted affairs, and his worthy colleagues, " whilſt they *trembled* at the proſpect of ſuch di- " ſtreſſes as the Commons and miniſtry have ſince " brought upon themſelves, were not *afraid* ſtea- " dily to look in the face that glaring and dazzling " influence, at which the eyes of eagles have " blenched."

I will firſt examine the ſtate of affairs in America, in order to explain whether the *trembling* of this noble lord and his colleagues, ſo perfectly *worthy* of being conjoined with him, and which produced the repeal of the ſtamp act, be an *heroic* virtue. And then I will examine that fortitude, " with which they looked in the face, that dazzling influence at which the eyes of eagles have *blenched.*" To this intent, I ſhall ſelect the words of this ſpeaker, as thoſe which can beſt protect me from the charges of prejudice and partiality, in deſcribing the conduct of the Americans at that time. You have already heard from *him*, " that *inſurrections* were *univerſal*; the *ſtamp papers ſeized* and

and *burned*; the *officers forced* to *reſign* their commiſſions under the *gallows*; the *houſes* of the *magiſtrates rifled* and *pulled down*, and all who dared to *write* and *ſpeak* in defence of the powers of parliament, *expelled* their *country*."

To theſe he adds, " when the accounts of the " American governors came before the houſe, " they appeared ſtronger even than the warmth " of public imagination had painted them.—— " All the late diſturbances, which have been, " at one time, the miniſters motives for the re- " peal of five out of ſix of the new court taxes; " and are now the pretence for refuſing to repeal " the ſixth, did not amount to——Why do I " compare them? No, not a tenth part of the " tumults and violence which prevailed long be- " fore the repeal of that act.*

The intent to remove Mr. Grenville from adminiſtration, together with the others who held the ſuperior offices, took its riſe from the injudicious omiſſion of the princeſs of Wales, in the act for eſtabliſhing a regency. As this event was ſudden, the ſupplying of their places was attended with ſome precipitation. The marquis of Rockingham, as it was then ſaid and believed, was reluctantly induced to accept the lead in the Treaſury and in adminiſtration. The veteran duke of Newcaſtle, in the place of privy-ſeal, was appointed dry-nurſe; and Edmund Burke, in the name of private ſecretary, was made rocker to the young miniſter.

As foreſight is not one of the attributes with which your orator has ſo ſplendidly adorned his miniſter, the approach of the ſtorm from America was

* P. 69. of the ſpeech.

was not diſcerned. Accordingly, when it was known in this kingdom, the new miniſters began to perceive, that their preceding conduct in parliament, had produced much greater diſturbance than they expected or deſired; now the executive power of the ſtate was fallen into their own hands. In conſequence of this event, they became as uneaſy as rats in a hot kettle, and as unacquainted by what means to eſcape from their ſcalding ſituation.

Their embarraſsments were as great as they were unforeſeen. On the part of this kingdom, the ſovereign authority ſtared them full in the face, and demanded to be ſuſtained. On the part of the colonies, thoſe principles and opinions which theſe miniſters, when in oppoſition, had avowed in parliament, and which had incenſed the Americans to thoſe outrages in which they were then engaged, called on them to renounce the parliamentary right, not only of internal, but of all taxation, becauſe the coloniſts were not repreſented in the houſe of commons. Such was the ſituation of affairs in England, when the Rockingham miniſtry aſcended to power.

As the Americans had extended their objections to *external* equally with *internal* taxation, that circumſtance would have afforded the new miniſtry a favorable opportunity of diſentangling themſelves from the briars in which they were caught. But it paſſed unobſerved by all the great faculties of the miniſter and his worthy collegues. It was evident that by theſe men the repeal of the ſtamp-act could not be refuſed, becauſe it was an *internal* tax, which they had uniformly decried. But the right to *external* taxation ſhould have been ſupported becauſe they themſelves, in oppoſition, had allowed it to be conſtitutional. At the ſame time, to annihilate all cauſe of contention, reſpecting the right of

parliament

parliament over the Americans, that miniſtry ſhould have propoſed to them the ſending of members to the houſe of commons.

This conduct would have perfectly coincided with their former profeſſions and pretexts, in adopting the cauſe of the Americans. It would have imparted the face of principle and deſign in their oppoſition to the preceding miniſtry. Had the colonies acquieſced in this propoſition of repreſentatives, the grand object of preſerving the legiſlative authority over America had been obtained, and the cauſe of clamour in America removed. If the coloniſts had refuſed to comply with that propoſal, that obſtinacy would have evinced their intentions of detaching themſelves from all parliamentary influence; have juſtified the proceedings of the miniſter to ſuſtain the ſupreme authority of Britain; and have produced one univerſal reſentment of their impudence and injuſtice in this country. As either one or other of theſe events muſt have been the conſequence of the preceding conduct, it is manifeſt they were then ſo auſpiciouſly circumſtanced as to poſſeſs the means of eſcaping from their dreaded difficulties with reputation. But the *ſound principles*, the *enlarged mind*, the *ſagacious ſenſe* and the *unſhaken fortitude* which Mr. Burke ſaw in his maſter conducted him by another road, the effects of which ſhall ſoon be laid before you.

With a view to obviate the charge of ſacrificing the Britiſh ſovereignty to the rebellion of the coloniſts, the miniſters paſſed an act declaratory of the legiſlative right to tax America without *qualification* reſpecting either the *external* or *internal* mode of laying duties, and then by another they repealed the ſtamp-act *totally*.*

By

* Speech, p. 66.

By the firſt they imagined that every imputation of having ſurrendered the legiſlative authority to the inſolence of the coloniſts, would be moſt effectually averted. If the immenſe talents of that miniſter be to be decided by this procedure, it evinces he was a novice in the ſcience of human kind. For, inſtead of effecting what they expected, it proved to demonſtration, their *unprincipled* proceedings in oppoſition to the late miniſtry; ſince it contradicted all that they had avowed reſpecting the *limited* right of parliament to tax America *unrepreſented*. It confirmed the opinion that the previous adminiſtration had acted juſtly and conſtitutionally in obtaining the ſtamp-act; and that the *then* miniſtry had oppoſed them with a conſciouſneſs of *their* being wrong in that oppoſition. And thus they ſtood as ſelf condemned and deſpicable culprits, ratified by their own act in parliament.

By this *unqualified* act of the legiſlature alſo, the Americans were in fact made rebels againſt the ſovereign authority. For the parliamentary right of enacting the ſtamp-act being now legiſlatively declared to be conſtitutional; the outrages which had been committed in the colonies were conſequently determined to be rebellious. This was the firſt ſervice the new miniſters performed for their American favourites, whoſe cauſe they had eſpouſed. Thus, as the reſult of his own proceedings, as well as by the duty of his office, it became an indiſpenſible obligation on the new miniſter to compel the Americans to an acknowledgement of the Btitiſh right of legiſlature, before the ſtamp-act was repealed; or never to have repealed it. On the contrary, without exerting the leaſt endeavour to obtain the ſlighteſt conceſſion from the coloniſts, that the parliamentary authority was legally exerciſed in

America,

America, they repealed the ſtamp-act *totally*, and without conditions. And yet by this conduct, did that miniſtry expect to continue in the enjoyment of power, place, and riches, approved both by Britons and Americans.

But ſo diſſimilar was the event to the expectation; that the people of England beheld this declaratory and *unqualified* act, like the waxen figure of king William, in a glaſs caſe, in Weſtminſter-Abbey, decorated with all the trappings and inſignia of ſovereignty, the ineffective mockery of life and power; a deluſion by which their underſtandings were to be inſulted. And thus by the miniſterial affectation of aſcertaining the parliamentary right by law, and renouncing it in practice by the repeal of the ſtamp-act, the people were led to conſider that repeal, as an act declaratory that they intended virtually to aboliſh the Britiſh ſovereignty in America, which they had ſpeciouſly ſupported by parliament. Hence a conviction naturally enſued, that the then miniſtry were regardleſs of their country's honour; ſunk in abject timidity; and attentive ſolely to their own intereſts.

On the other hand, the Americans beheld this declaratory and *unqualified* act, ſometimes as a ſcandalous deſertion of thoſe principles and arguments which theſe miniſters, when in oppoſition, had ſo unreſervedly avowed and promiſed to ſupport. At others they conſidered it as totally void of all principle, as they had now attempted to eſtabliſh an authority which they had conſtantly averred the parliament did not legally poſſeſs: and therefore, intending to fix that power which they could not juſtify, they were reſolved to exceed the former, and to act more arbitrarily in their adminiſtration. At the ſame time they

abſtained not from deriding the new miniſterial idea of eſtabliſhing a parliamentary right, over America, by that very *parliament* whoſe authority, theſe miniſters had formerly ſuſtained, and taught them to believe, was inadequate to that right. The repeal of the ſtamp-act was therefore received as a temporary expedient to reduce *them* to tranquility, whilſt the miniſterial intrigues were carrying on for permanently fixing the legiſlative authority in the colonies. By theſe proceedings, nothing was ſettled but diſcontent both in Britain and America.

In this behaviour, the diſcerning ſaw no mark either of a ſound principle, an enlarged mind, a ſagacious ſenſe, or an unſhaken fortitude. But they beheld a rich redundance of the *heroic virtue* of being abſolutely *intimidated* from acting with regard to the *welfare* of their *country*. They ſaw them *virtuouſly ſculking* behind a *majority* in parliament in this kingdom; and *heroically fleeing* before the rebels in America, with that contempt for their underſtandings, and indignation at their puſillanimity which they deſerved.

The whole of this ſingular tranſaction was conducted by the ſelf-intereſted and deſpicable cunning of a cheeſemonger, choſen arbitrator between his two cuſtomers, Tom Thimble the taylor, and Ebenezar Slipthumb the woollen-draper. Matthew Maggot, "*becauſe a modification is the conſtant* "*reſource of weak and undeciding minds*," reſolved to *refine* and to preſerve his *intereſt* with both parties. By this policy, he doubted not but ſtill to continue in the emoluments ariſing from the ſale of his old Cheſhire and double Glouceſter. With vaſt circumſpection, and ſelf-applauſe, he therefore determined, that Tom *had* the *right* to

what

what he demanded ; but that Ebenezar ſhould be excuſed *from* complying *with it*. Tom was diſpleaſed, becauſe he thought a right which was not to be exerted, was of no value. Ebenezar, becauſe the right was againſt him, and altho' it were not now to be exerted, it might be on future occaſions. And thus by this refinement in *clear* and *ſagacious ſenſe*, *Matthew* loſt both his cuſtomers ; fell into diſgrace among his neighbours, reſpecting his intellects and ſelfiſhneſs; was deſerted by his former followers ; became a ſufferer in his profits ; and a bankrupt in reputation.

Such was the conduct of that miniſtry, who were not to be ſatisfied with "the *bon ton* of the "court, a *modification* like the preſent timid, un-"ſyſtematic, procraſtinating miniſtry, becauſe a "modification is the conſtant reſource of weak "undeciding minds." This reflection undoubtedly comes with double *propriety* and *juſtneſs* from your orator, and his maſter, who through *timidity* fled before the Americans in rebellion. Who were *ſyſtematically* wrong, by enacting one law and repealing another. Who diſpleaſed both ſides of the queſtion, and hoped to *procraſtinate* the evil day of an open rupture, and their own diſmiſſion. Whereas the preſent miniſtry are, and have been with real fortitude *ſyſtematically* advancing to ſubdue that rebellion, which was excited by this orator and his worthy aſſociates.

Such having been their exhibition of the *heroic virtue* of *timidity*, relative to the Americans, I come now to ſhew the unſhaken fortitude of the noble lord and his worthy colleagues, "who were not afraid to look in the face that glaring and dazzling influence at which the eyes of eagles have blenched." And what do you imagine

this *dazzling influence* was, at which the *more* than *eagle-eyed miniſtry* did *not* blench? it was "the *face* "of one of the ableſt, and let him ſay, not the "moſt ſcrupulous oppoſitions that ever was in that "houſe, and withſtood it, unaided even by one "of the uſual ſupports of adminiſtration." Oh what an act of heroiſm was here. Let no man henceforth mention Leonidas, againſt the Perſians, at the ſtraits of Thermopylæ!

By being unſupported by *one* of the uſual *ſupports*, I imagine he muſt mean that *one* called a *ſound judgement*. For is there a man ſo ignorant or ſo credulous as to believe they were not backed by all thoſe other ſupports of power, place, and money, that obtained all other majorities? How unſhaken in more than eagle-eyed fortitude was this miniſter?- he looked *unblenching* in the face of oppoſition, againſt which had he been accompanied with two hundred and eighty dwarfs in underſtanding, ſtrength and courage, provided they poſſeſſed the dangerleſs intrepidity of ſaying *Aye*, he muſt inevitably have overcome two hundred and ſeventy eight opponents, although each of them had been a giant in all the preceding faculties of ſoul and body. An act ſo ſingularly heroic, that none but an orator ſo ſingularly poſſeſſed of all the powers of rhetoric, could have executed the taſk of being his adequate panegyriſt. An orator, who more than *eagle-eyed* ſo glorioufly fought with his colleagues in this dazzling battle; after they had fled from rebels to their country, without daring to offer the leaſt oppoſition. And this, *like* Demoſthenes in running away only, he would perſuade you was a deed of unſhaken fortitude.

But of what action will he leave the juſtification unattempted, who ſays that the miniſter in this conqueſt

conqueſt in the houſe of commons, "was unaided by even *one of the uſual ſupports of adminiſtration.*"

Not a man of the treaſury, admiralty, trade, and plantation boards, not a placeman, penſioner, nor officer civil or military, voted in the repeal of this bill; none but diſintereſted and independent members. This he had the confidence to ſpeak in the face of hundreds, conſcious, both *he* and *they*, that it was untrue. This he has the confidence to publiſh to you who are in like manner convinced of this untruth. This too I ſuppoſe he will deem an act of unſhaken fortitude. It is indeed an act that may juſtly create aſtoniſhment, at leaſt, in any man except this orator.

But the fortitude of the miniſter was exerciſed in a yet more courageous manner. "He looked "in the face of perſon he had long reſpected and re- "garded, and whoſe *aid* was then particularly want- "ed: he means lord Chatham. He did this when "he paſſed the declaratory act." From this paſſage, it is evident that this ſpeaker conſiders the lord, juſt mentioned, as a more formidable opponent than all the oppoſition of the other commons. But whence did it ariſe that this miniſter of ſuch enlargement of mind, ſuch clear and ſagacious ſenſe, ſhould want the aſſiſtance of that lord? was the looking him in the face an act of unſhaken fortitude, when he had no other way to look? and yet you ſhall find, from the words of this very ſpeaker, that no man could in fact be leſs formidable, than this lord; if his pourtraiture of him be juſt.

"It is now given out," ſays your orator, "for "the uſual purpoſes, that lord Rockingham did "not conſent to the repeal of the ſtamp-act, un- "til he was bullied into it by lord Chatham;

" and the reporters have gone ſo far, as publicly " to aſſert, in an hundred companies, that ge- " neral Conway, who propoſed the repeal in the " American committee, had another ſet of re- " ſolutions in his pocket, directly the reverſe of " thoſe he moved. Theſe artifices of a deſperate " cauſe are, at this time, ſpread abroad with in- " credible care, as if the induſtry of the circula- " tion were to make amends for the abſurdity of " of the report." And then, as a refutation of this abſurdity, he ſays, " whether the noble lord " is of a complexion to be bullied by lord Chat- " ham, or by any man, I muſt ſubmit to thoſe who " know him," with which I acquieſce. And thus this charge of timidity, ſo abſurd and ſo induſtriouſly propagated in converſation, is now *propagated* in print, and left without a refutation; and you hear no more of the ſecond ſet of reſolutions in general Conway's pocket. Does not this evaſion of anſwer appear to be adopted, becauſe the aſſertions cannot be diſproved?

It is pleaſant to ſee, with what aggravation of magnanimity, this ſpeaker repreſents lord Rockingham on this occaſion. " I confeſs, when I " look back to that time," ſays he, " I conſider " him as placed in one of the moſt trying ſituati- " ons in which, perhaps, any man ever ſtood? in " the houſe of peers, there were very few of the " miniſtry, out of the noble lord's particular con- " nexion, (except lord Egmont, who acted, as " far as he could diſcern, an honourable part) that " did not look to ſome other future arrangement, " which warped his politics." This trying ſituation I have already explained, and he informs you,* leſt

* Speech, p. 65.

leſt you ſhould believe him, "they had powerful "friends, the means of fighting a great battle, and "of gaining the victory," which was certainly *as trying a ſituation as ever man did ſtand in.* But theſe lords, whoſe honour he preſumes ſo egregiouſly to traduce, did nevertheleſs vote with the noble lord. They did indeed, as he ſays, look to ſome future arrangement, which *did not warp their politics*, but confirmed their judgement, that the noble lord's time of adminiſtration was expiring. "There "were, in truth, in both houſes, new and me-"nacing appearances that might very naturally "drive any other than a moſt reſolute miniſter "from his meaſure, or from his ſtation." I have already ſpoken ſufficiently of his *reſolution.* His meaſure he was permitted to carry to his ruin as a miniſter; for in conſequence of that meaſure, he ſoon loſt his ſtation. "The houſhold troops "openly revolted; the allies of the miniſtry (who "refuſed reſponſibility for any) endeavoured to "undermine their credit, and took ground that "muſt be fatal to the ſucceſs of the very cauſe "which they would be thought to countenance." In what a pitiful ſtate of deſertion does he place that miniſter, whom he intends to laud and magnify; and to whom he is indebted for the means of all that importance which he ſo ſuperciliouſly aſſumes. Is it not a judicious method of ſupporting the character he was delineating for poſterity, to repreſent both houſes of parliament ſurveying him as a man, who by ſtatute declaring the right of parliament to tax the Americans, firſt makes them rebels; and then by another, diſmiſſes them unacknowledging the offence, with the gratification of their demands? Who deſerts the executive power of the ſtate, and offers up the ſupreme au-

thority of the realm to timidity, and the groundleſs expectation of preſerving his poſt, which they ſaw to be impoſſible. Sir John Falſtaffe values himſelf for his knowing the true prince by the inſtinct of a lion. Both houſes diſcovered the miniſter by a very different kind of inſtinct. It was that of *rats*, which always deſert a falling houſe.

" The queſtion of the repeal was brought on by " miniſtry, in the very inſtant when it was known " that more than one court negociation was carry- " ing on with the heads of the oppoſition." And at that inſtant it was too late for the miniſter to recede. " Every thing, on every ſide, was full of " traps and mines," and thoſe for whom they were intended, were either caught in the former, or were blown up by the latter. But it was not the two houſes, and the court alone, which diſcerned the miſchief he was bringing on his country. " Earth below ſhook; heaven above " menaced, all the elements of miniſterial ſafety " were diſſolved." But to what intent was all this convulſion? It was, that earth expreſſed her diſapprobation of his proceeding; the heavens menaced him with their wrath; and what is more than all, *indiſſoluble* things, even *elements*, were *diſſolved:* and thus he ſtood perilouſly diſapproved by heaven, earth, and man. I confeſs indeed that this is the firſt time I ever heard that heaven and earth, or any thing elſe, could be *elements* of miniſterial ſafety. Does he mean by theſe *elements*, that there was *no* more *money* in the *Treaſury*, and that therefore they were diſſolved?

" It was in the midſt of this *chaos* of plots and counterplots," heaven, earth, and man, plotting and counterplotting againſt a miniſter, whom they ſaw to need no other plots nor counterplots than his

his own *ſound principle, enlarged mind, ſagacious ſenſe, and unſhaken fortitude*, aſſiſted by thoſe of his ſecretary, to bring upon him inevitable ruin. However, " it was in the midſt of this complicated " warfare, againſt public oppoſition and private " treachery, that the firmneſs of that noble per- " ſon was put to the proof. He never ſtirred from " his ground; no, not an inch." He was ſure of a majority in this repeal: on the accompliſhment of which the general deſertion of all around him took place. And with reſpect to his firmneſs, *of not ſtirring an inch*, it is evident, he had *not* an inch to ſtir; unleſs he had practiſed that heroic timidity of yielding before the oppoſition, without one verbal conteſt, as he did before the rebellious Americans. " He remained fixed and determined in " principle, in meaſure, and in conduct." How fatal theſe have proved to this country, has been already ſhewn, and ſhall be farther elucidated. " He practiſed no managements." Is it not manifeſt, that he knew nothing of management? " He ſecured no retreat." There was no man oppoſed his going off. " He ſought no apolo- " gy." He left that to his ſecretary, and it is executed as the cauſe deſerves.

" I will likewiſe do juſtice," he adds, " I ought " to do it, to general Conway; far from the du- " plicity, wickedly charged on him, he acted his " part with alacrity and reſolution." Whether he acted with duplicity or not, I have neither grounds on which to determine, nor inclination to charge him with ſuch behaviour. But of this I am ſure, I ſhould requeſt every friend, who intended to be my advocate againſt double-dealing, to uſe better arguments in diſproof of it, " than acting with alacrity and reſolution." For theſe are as

equally

equally reconcilable with duplicity as with the moſt ſimple deed that can be tranſacted.

" We all felt inſpired by the example he gave " us, down even to myſelf," ſays he, "the weakeſt " in the phalanx." Who now *uninſpired* aſſumes an importance, that would have been ridiculous in the ſtrongeſt. " I declare for me," he adds, " I knew well enough." But how? He tells you, " it could not be concealed from any body, the " true ſtate of things; but in my life," he adds, " I never came with ſo much ſpirits into the " houſe. It was a time for a man to act in." And now he diſcovers the true ſtate of things. " We had powerful enemies; but we had faithful " and determined friends, and a glorious cauſe. " We had a great battle to fight, but we had the " means of fighting; not as now, when our hands " are tied behind us. We did fight that day and " conquer." Such was the ſtate of things, and it was really a true time for a *man* to act in, who knew he was ſure of victory before he engaged. And hence it appears, that all the formidable deſcription which he has juſt given, of diſhonourable and unmanly lords; of the houſhold troops revolting; of treacherous aſſociates; of earth below that trembled, and heaven above that menaced; of chaotic plots and counterplots; and of the unſhaken fortitude of the miniſter that contemned them all, had no exiſtence. The miniſter and his colleagues entered on this battle with the unconquerable phalanx of a known majority; which gave ſuch *ſpirits* to this orator, and proves, that thoſe, whom he would deſcribe as *deſerters*, did adhere to his maſter. Or by what poſſible means could the majority have been obtained? But now, alas! " *their arms are tied behind them.*"

them." Happy had it been, for this nation, had they been bound on that day! happy it is they ſtill remain in bondage. We ſhall now behold the ſupreme legiſlative power; the dignity of the king; and the authority of the laws reſtored and ſupported in America; Rebellion ſubdued; and one general execration will be heard of all thoſe, who by deluſive arguments, have excited them to oppoſe that ſovereignty which they were born to obey; and which it was at once their duty and their intereſt to acknowledge and preſerve.

He continues: "I remember with a melan-"choly pleaſure," the ſituation of Mr. Conway, who made the motion for the repeal, "when the "whole trading intereſt of this empire, crammed "into your lobbies, with a trembling and anxious "expectation, waited almoſt to a winter's return "of light, their fate from your reſolutions." I ſhall immediately attempt to aſſign the cauſe of this preſent *melancholy*, on remembering the paſt *pleaſure*. But is the whole trading intereſting of this empire ſuſceptible of being crammed into the lobbies of the houſe of Commons? Surely they were either *miraculouſly* enlarged on that great day, or are *hyperbolically* ſo in this ſpeech. But in reality was there a merchant preſent, except the American, in whom all conſideration for the dignity and rights of his country were ſuperſeded by private intereſt? It is reaſonable enough to believe indeed, that their trembling anxiety and expectations were great. Since, according to the words of this orator, they had been crammed into the lobbies almoſt all the *ſpring*, *ſummer*, and *autumn*, waiting for the *winter's return of light*, to know their fate.

It was no wonder therefore, that being ſo long crammed together, like herrings in a barrel, when "the figure of their deliverer was ſhewn them, "in the well-earned triumph of his important victo-"ry in their favour, that from the whole of that "grave multitude, there aroſe an *involuntary* burſt "of gratitude and tranſport." What new kind of *gratitude* muſt this be, which riſes *againſt the will* of him who ſhews it? By what obligation was their deliverer bound by ſuch an *applauſive gratitude* as they could not *abſtain from giving him?* But this accurate ſpeaker contains an inexhauſtible mine of new and wonderful diſcoveries, in the ſcience of human nature.

"They jumped upon the general like children on "a long abſent father." I hope they did *that* alſo *involuntarily*. Otherwiſe, the whole trading intereſt of this empire, jumping on a man's back, ſeems to be a weight that few will conſider as very expreſſive of good-will. "They clung about him "as captives about their redeemer." They certainly thought he had redeemed the money from *captivity* that was owing them from America. "All England, all America, joined in his ap-"plauſe." I apprehend here is ſome miſtake, at leaſt, reſpecting *all* England.

He then ſays of Mr. Conway: "*Hope elevated,* "*and joy brightened his creſt.* That he ſtood near "him, and that his face was as if it had been the "face of an *angel,*" concerning which ſimilitude, as I have never ſeen either an angel or Mr. Conway, I have nothing to ſay. "I do not know," ſays he, "how "others feel, but if I had ſtood in that ſituation, "I never would have exchanged it for all that "kings, in their profuſion could beſtow." What will you conceive of that man, whoſe virtue would have

have thus exulted, had he been the leader in that debate, which ended in the flagitious immolation of the Britiſh ſovereignty to American rebellion?

But Mr. Conway has not perſevered in that ſentiment, as you are told by the orator. "I did "hope," ſays he, "that that day's danger would "have been a bond to hold us together for ever. "But alas! that, with other pleaſing viſions, is "long ſince vaniſhed." Is it not hence that *melancholy* ſprings which attends the *remembrance* of that day's *pleaſure?* His place, and all his viſions of approaching greatneſs, even his hopes, are vaniſhed. This is indeed a circumſtance that may naturally depreſs a ſtout heart with *melancholy*.

He then ſays, of that miniſtry, "they differed "fundamentally from the ſcheme of both parties, "but they preſerved the object of both." Is there not ſomething incomprehenſible in this, that a miniſtry ſhould *fundamentally* differ from two ſchemes of others, and yet *preſerve the objects* of *both?* Is not the obtaining of the *end*, the *fundamental object* of all ſchemes? How then do theſe ſchemes differ? "They preſerved the "*authority* of Great Britain; they preſerved the "*equity*; they made the declaratory act; they re-"pealed the ſtamp act. They did both *fully*, be-"cauſe the declaratory act was *without qualification*, "and the repeal of the ſtamp act *total*." The excellence of this *fundamental* difference in ſchemes, from that of all other miniſters, I have already expoſed to your view, reſpecting the *authority* of Great Britain. I will now ſhew you in what manner they preſerved her *equity*.

Is it not inſeparable from every idea of national *equity*, that the ſame *authority* ſhould prevail through all dominions of the *ſame* ſovereign? That all his

ſub-

ſubjects ſhould be as *equally* taxed, in ſupport of the general welfare, as the nature of their circumſtances can bear? And that you, the people of England, ſhould not be more than proportionably oppreſſed in ſuch taxations? Are not theſe the indiſputable characteriſtics of *national equity?* And yet theſe preſervers of Britiſh *equity*, ſuſpended the executive power of parliament over the Americans; relieved them from taxes raiſed *for* their own ſupport alone; and left you oppreſſed by enormous debts contracted in their defence, and expoſed to the like oppreſſion for the future. Such were their means of *preſerving* the *equity* of Britain. Are theſe marks of thoſe *ſound principles*, that *enlargement of mind*, that *clear* and *ſagacious ſenſe*, that *unſhaken fortitude*, which this orator did ſee in that noble lord and miniſter? Are the juſtification of ſuch a cauſe, the falacy of ſuch arguments, and the confidence of this ſpeaker, ſuch ſigns as can create belief, that he ſaw thoſe exalted qualities in his maſter? Do theſe means expreſs either a knowledge of *national equity*, or a deſire of preſerving it?

I have given him my opinion, and my reaſons in ſupport of it. Perhaps that may prove a ſufficient anſwer, "if the principle of the declaratory act "was not good, he adds, the principle we are con-"tending for this day is monſtrous." If, by this principle, he means the ſupport of parliamentary authority then is it good; and ſo alſo is that principle, for which the miniſtry are contending, for both are the ſame. But ſhould this queſtion be aſked him, ſince the principle, the right of the ſovereign authority pronounced in the declaratory act is good, why did you renounce the exertion

ertion of it in favour of rebellion, what *would the adverſary ſay to that?*

" If the principle of the repeal was not good, " ſays he, why are we not at war for a real ſub- " ſtantial effective revenue?" are they not preparing by arms to obtain that end, if milder means cannot prevail; and for another inexpreſſibly more important, the reſtoration of the exerciſe of that *principle* which, by the repeal of the ſtamp-act, was all but annihilated. By which act, the *principle* on which it was *perpetrated* appears to be the moſt ignominiouſly degrading of national honour; and egregiouſly exhibitive of broken confidence in the executive power, that can be found on record.

" If both were bad, why has this miniſtry in- " curred all the incumbrances of both and of all " ſchemes? why have they enacted, repealed, en- " forced, yielded, and now attempt to enforce " again?" that both were bad aroſe from their being managed by this orator and his maſter. But that this charge on the preſent miniſtry, of enacting and repealing, has no ground, I have repeatedly proved.

" I think, ſays he, I may as well now, as at " any other time, ſpeak to a certain matter of " fact, not wholly unrelated to the queſtion under " your conſideration." To the full as well now as at any time, it is "that the court leaders have given " out to all their corps this cant againſt him, and " all thoſe who would prevent the miniſtry from " the frantic war, is that all the diſturbances in " America have been created by the repeal of the " ſtamp-act. I ſuppreſs, ſays he, for a moment, " my indignation at the falſehood, baſeneſs, and " abſurdity of this moſt audacious aſſertion." I will venture to affirm that no miniſter ever declared

himſelf

ſubjects ſhould be as *equally* taxed, in ſupport of the general welfare, as the nature of their circumſtances can bear? And that you, the people of England, ſhould not be more than proportionably oppreſſed in ſuch taxations? Are not theſe the indiſputable characteriſtics of *national equity?* And yet theſe preſervers of Britiſh *equity*, ſuſpended the executive power of parliament over the Americans; relieved them from taxes raiſed *for* their own ſupport alone; and left you oppreſſed by enormous debts contracted in their defence, and expoſed to the like oppreſſion for the future. Such were their means of *preſerving* the *equity* of Britain. Are theſe marks of thoſe *ſound principles*, that *enlargement of mind*, that *clear* and *ſagacious ſenſe*, that *unſhaken fortitude*, which this orator did ſee in that noble lord and miniſter? Are the juſtification of ſuch a cauſe, the falacy of ſuch arguments, and the confidence of this ſpeaker, ſuch ſigns as can create belief, that he ſaw thoſe exalted qualities in his maſter? Do theſe means expreſs either a knowledge of *national equity*, or a deſire of preſerving it?

I have given him my opinion, and my reaſons in ſupport of it. Perhaps that may prove a ſufficient anſwer, "if the principle of the declaratory act "was not good, he adds, the principle we are con- "tending for this day is monſtrous." If, by this principle, he means the ſupport of parliamentary authority then is it good; and ſo alſo is that principle, for which the miniſtry are contending, for both are the ſame. But ſhould this queſtion be aſked him, ſince the principle, the right of the ſovereign authority pronounced in the declaratory act is good, why did you renounce the exertion

ertion of it in favour of rebellion, what *would the adverſary ſay to that?*

" If the principle of the repeal was not good, " ſays he, why are we not at war for a real ſub- " ſtantial effective revenue?" are they not preparing by arms to obtain that end, if milder means cannot prevail; and for another inexpreſſibly more important, the reſtoration of the exerciſe of that *principle* which, by the repeal of the ſtamp-act, was all but annihilated. By which act, the *principle* on which it was *perpetrated* appears to be the moſt ignominiouſly degrading of national honour; and egregiouſly exhibitive of broken confidence in the executive power, that can be found on record.

" If both were bad, why has this miniſtry in- " curred all the incumbrances of both and of all " ſchemes? why have they enacted, repealed, en- " forced, yielded, and now attempt to enforce " again?" that both were bad aroſe from their being managed by this orator and his maſter. But that this charge on the preſent miniſtry, of enacting and repealing, has no ground, I have repeatedly proved.

" I think, ſays he, I may as well now, as at " any other time, ſpeak to a certain matter of " fact, not wholly unrelated to the queſtion under " your conſideration." To the full as well now as at any time, it is "that the court leaders have given " out to all their corps this cant againſt him, and " all thoſe who would prevent the miniſtry from " the frantic war, is that all the diſturbances in " America have been created by the repeal of the " ſtamp-act. I ſuppreſs, ſays he, for a moment, " my indignation at the falſehood, baſeneſs, and " abſurdity of this moſt audacious aſſertion." I will venture to affirm that no miniſter ever declared

himſelf

himſelf of that opinion. They not only know and declare that the fact was otherwiſe ; but that the firſt rebellion of the Americans proceeded from the ſpeeches of *that* miniſtry, when in oppoſition; that their puſillanimous flight, before thoſe rebels ſtrengthened their reſolution of exciting diſturbances in America; and that repealing of the ſtamp-act confirmed them in their purſuits. Such are the known ſentiments and declaration not only of courtiers, but of all men who can reflect and be honeſt in their ſpeech. But it ſeems this man of mighty words, ſtung with *indignation*, but *ſuppreſſed*, at ſo falſe, baſe, abſurd, and audacious an aſſertion, riſes in refutation of the repeal of the ſtamp-act as being the cauſe of theſe American diſturbances. And thereby he robs his maſter of the means of exculpation, which are offered from an inability of foreſeeing, that ſuch diſturbances would be the iſſue of that repeal. And thus he cunningly ſends you back to proofs that cannot but evince that thoſe diſturbances ſprang from previous opinions delivered by them in parliament. Such is the amazing ingenuity of this orator, in confuting the reports of his opponents, and in confirming his maſter's innocence.

Let but this low cant, inſufferable as it is to his *ſenſe* of *honour*, his *love* of *truth*, his *averſion* from *abſurdity*, and his *horror* at *audaciouſneſs*, be written as it was delivered, even by thoſe who have ſpoken it without authority, and it becomes indiſputable *truth*. "All the *preſent* diſturbances in America have been created by the repeal of the ſtamp-act." Is there a man of common ſenſe now living that is not fully perſuaded, that had Mr. Grenville remained miniſter to this day, that the legiſlative authority of Britain had been fully eſtabliſhed in America,

America, by perſevering in the ſupport of the ſtamp-act? has not the repeal, therefore, by the Rockingham miniſtry been the *certain cauſe* of the preſent diſturbances? their harangues in parliament had cauſed thoſe diſturbances which frightened themſelves into that repeal. And that act of timidity neceſſarily produced the ſubſequent, acts to reſtore the Britiſh ſovereignty which cauſed the *preſent* diſturbances. For once, therefore, I coincide with this orator; that there were diſturbances in America before the abrogation of the ſtamp-act; and yet I aſſert the *preſent* were cauſed by the repeal of that act.

Such being the iſſue of his indignation, *ſuppreſſed* in the charges of *falſehood*, *baſeneſs*, *abſurdity*, *and audacious aſſertion*, he virulently proceeds. "This "vermin of court reporters, when they are forced "into day, upon one point, are ſure to burrow "in another:" what a happy preſervation is viſible in all his metaphors." Do vermin *burrow* in a *point*, and are they forced *upon* the *point* in which they have *burrowed?* however, "they ſhall have "no refuge, he will make them bolt out of their "holes." And thus the *points* are become *holes*. "Conſcious, ſays he, that they muſt be baffled, "when they attribute a precedent diſturbance to a "ſubſequent meaſure, they take other ground al-"moſt as abſurd, but very common in modern "practice, and very wicked; which is to attribute "the ill effect of ill-judged conduct, to the ar-"guments which had been uſed to diſſuade us "from it. They ſay that the oppoſition made in "parliament to the ſtamp-act at the time of its "paſſing, encouraged the Americans to their re-"ſiſtance. This, ſays he, a Dr. Tucker has de-"clared in print. But this aſſertion too, juſt like

"the reſt, is falſe." It is indeed as *exactly falſe* as the reſt. I leave the dean and the orator to ſettle which of them is to be believed. And I appeal to evidence, infinitely more unexceptionable than that of both of them, for the truth of that aſſertion which this ſpeaker pronounces to be falſe.

I have already ſhewn you, from governor Bernard's letters, what were the opinions which the Americans adopted and purſued on being informed of what paſſed in the commons, reſpecting repreſentation in parliament and internal taxation. Altho' that be ſufficient proof of the preceding fact, yet I will recur to a letter which hath been already quoted, dated Jan. 28, 1768. He ſays, "it was eaſy to be foreſeen that the *diſtinctions* uſed in *parliament* in *favour* of the *Americans* would be adopted by them, and received as fundamental laws. It would ſignify nothing by *what number* theſe diſtinctions were *rejected*; the reſpectableneſs of the names of the promoters of them, and the apparent intereſt of the Americans in maintaining them, would outweigh all authority of numbers for the contrary opinion. It was alſo to be foreſeen, that the Americans would carry theſe diſtinctions much further than the promoters could poſſibly intend they ſhould be." Will this orator now perſiſt in the face of this teſtimony, that it is *a falſe aſſertion*, that the oppoſition in parliament to the ſtamp-act, at the time of its paſſing, encouraged the Americans to their reſiſtance? all his appeal to papers on the table and to witneſſes produced in the houſe, and their ſilence on this head, weigh not a grain in oppoſition to the preceding letter which fully and irrefragably evinces that truth, which the orator ſo peremptorily denies. It refutes alſo what he ſays, when "ſitting a ſtranger

a ſtranger in the gallery, when the act was under conſideration, that, as he remembers, not more than two or three members ſpoke againſt the act."

" The agents and diſtributors of falſhoods," he aſſerts, " have, with their uſual induſtry, circulated another lye of the ſame nature with the former." Which *lye*, to borrow a *mode* of ſpeaking, natural and familiar to this orator, will be proved to be of the *nature* of *truth*. Let us examine it. " It is, that the diſturbances aroſe from " the account which had been received in Ame- " rica of the change in the miniſtry. No longer " awed, it ſeems, with the ſpirit of the former " rulers, they thought themſelves a match, for " what *our* calumniators chooſe to qualify by the " name of ſo feeble a miniſtry as ſucceeded." That theſe three accounts ſhould be propagated by the preſent miniſtry, can never find admiſſion, but in the head of ignorance itſelf. The firſt report, "that all the diſturbances in America, were created by the repeal of the ſtamp act," is overturned by the ſecond, "that the *oppoſition* made in parliament, at the time of *paſſing* that act, was the *cauſe* of theſe diſturbances:" *this* again was *overthrown* by the *report*, "that the *change* of miniſtry was the *cauſe* of theſe diſturbances." Can it be credited, that miniſters have ſet up theſe different and contradictory *reports* as men do ninepins, which, on one of them being ſtruck, it tumbles down the reſt. Theſe reports are ſuch as have been iſſued by the unthinking populace; and gathered like bits of old iron and farthings, by one who ſcratches in the dirt, and collects into an old hat, indiſcriminately, all that he can find, that will turn to any account.

In this charge of falſhood, place but the name of *hope*, inſtead of *diſturbances*, and all is right. For certainly their *hopes* of ſucceſs did ariſe, and their endeavours grow ſtronger, on that change of miniſtry.

In this paſſage the orator exalts himſelf, into the rank of a miniſter. He ſays, " for what *our* calumniators chooſe to qualify by the name of a feeble *miniſtry*." Does the word *calumniator* come with ſtrict propriety from Mr. Burke? I remember a town in the weſt of England, where the pig-driver, being appointed by the mayor, did always conſider himſelf as *one* of the corporation. On this conception of his being exalted to that dignity, whenever he cried the pigs in the pound, he invariably concluded with, God bleſs *Mr. Mayor* and the *reſt* of *our* corporation.

" Feeble in one ſenſe," he acknowledges, " theſe " men may certainly be called." And from what has been proved, are they not feeble in every ſenſe? " For," he continues, " with all their ef- " forts, and they have made many, they have not " been able to reſiſt the diſtempered vigour, and " inſane alacrity, with which the parliament are " ruſhing to their ruin." I ſhall preſume to give another reading to the latter part of this paſſage: and leave it to your deciſion on which ſide the truth is to be found. " They have *not* been able to *continue* the diſtempered vigour, and inſane alacrity, with which they were ruſhing to *your* ruin." " Thus," ſays he, " are blown away all the *in- ſect race* of courtly falſhoods; thus periſh the miſerable *inventions* of the wretched *runners* for a wretched cauſe, which they have *fly-blown* into every weak and *rotten* part of the country, in vain hopes that when their *maggots* had taken *wing*, their

their importunate *buzzing* might ſound ſomething like the *public voice!*" What an admirable diſplay of fertile invention, and of marvellous revelation in the animal creation is here afforded! An *inſect race* of *falſhoods* turn *runners*, theſe *runners fly-blow inventions* into a *rotten country*; which *inventions* become *winged maggots*; which *winged maggots buz* like the *voice* of a *whole people.* Oh! what a diſcovery is here of a *transformation*, utterly unknown to all the philoſophical ſocieties of the univerſe. Thus, like a ſky rocket, from an artificial fire that urges him below, he mounts into the air, bounces, crackles, ſparkles in a diverſity of colours, and then, by his natural ponderoſity, tumbles headlong into the vaſt *profund.*

He continues: "I have troubled you ſufficiently "with the ſtate of America before the repeal." of which one part was *after before* the repeal; "that of the diſturbances, which were cauſed *by* the *repeal.*" I will diſpute no man's right of *inheritance.* "And now," ſays he, "I turn to "Mr. Cornwall, who ſo ſtoutly challenges us to "tell, whether, after the repeal, the provinces "were quiet? This is coming home to the point. "Here I meet him directly; and anſwer him di"rectly, *they were quiet.* And I in my turn, chal"lenge him to prove when, and where, and by "whom, and in what numbers, and with what "violence, the other laws of trade, as gentlemen "aſſert, were violated in conſequence of your con"ceſſion, or that even your other revenue laws "were attacked? But I quit the vantage ground "on which I ſtand, and where I might leave the "burthen of the proof upon him. I walk down "upon the open plain, and undertake to ſhew, "that they were not only quiet, but ſhewed many

" unequivocal marks of acknowledgement and " gratitude. And to give him every advantage, " I ſelect the obnoxious colony of Maſſachuſets " Bay." What a generous condeſcenſion is this to Mr. Cornwall, from ſo great an orator!

And now you ſhall ſee his proofs of this tranquility, after the repeal. The aſſembly, in their addreſs to governor Bernard, tell him, " if it is not " *now* in our power, in ſo full a manner as will be " expected, *to ſhew our reſpectful gratitude* to the " mother country, or to make a *dutiful and affec-* " *tionate return* to the indulgence of the king and " parliament, it ſhall be no fault of ours; for this " we intend, and hope we ſhall be *able* fully to " effect."

Did there ever exiſt an orator who more effectually defeated the cauſe he undertook to ſupport? What was the cauſe that " put it *out* of their power fully to ſhew their *reſpectful gratitude* to their mother country; or to make a *dutiful and affectionate* return to the king and parliament, at that time?" Was it not the durſturbances of the people, which ſtill continuing, intimidated them from thoſe acts of duty? The very evidence he brings *unequivocally* diſproves the fact which he undertakes to ſupport. In confirmation of this truth, I refer you to the letters of governor Bernard, of Feb. 28th, 1766, and Jan. 20th, 1768, already inſerted in this anſwer, p. 14 and 15. In which it is ſaid, " the ſtamp-act is become a matter of indifference. The people have felt their ſtrength, and will not ſubmit readily to any thing they do not like." This was the ſtate of things in the colonies before the repeal. After it, the ſame governor declares, " when the *imperial* ſtate has ſo far given way, in the repeal of the ſtamp-act, as to let the *dependent*

ſtates

ſtates flatter themſelves, that their pretenſions are admiſſible, whatever terms of reconciliation time, accident, or deſign, *may* produce, if they are deficient in ſettling the true relation of *Great Britain* to her *colonies*; and aſcertaining the bounds of the *ſovereignty* of one, and the *dependence* of the other, conciliation will be no more than ſuſpenſion of hoſtilities." Hence it is clear, that their hoſtilities were *not* then ſuſpended; and that the repeal of the ſtamp-act, by its fugitive timidity, had been the cauſe of their continuance. For rebels are conſtantly flattered by ſuch conceſſions to perſevere in their treaſon.

What a ſtinging reprehenſion does governor Bernard give that miniſtry, who thus afforded to the Americans, by the repeal, that cauſe of flattering themſelves, that their pretenſions were admiſſible? But it was not in that miſtake alone they excited them to expect the whole of what they required. In his letter, Sept. 20th, 1768, when ſome hints were given by the *preſent* miniſtry, that his conduct ſhould be more ſpirited, he ſays, "in this ſpirited conduct I "perſiſted, till I found it did not agree with the "ſyſtem at home, which required lenient meaſures "and ſoft ſpeeches, to bring about conciliation "without correction. I knew that this would *not* "do with the people I had to deal with; but I "could not diſpute about it." This change of conduct was occaſioned by orders, from the Rockingham miniſtry, to be conciliatory and lenient. And if fame be to be relied on, theſe ſmooth ſpeeches were to conſiſt of intreaties, that the Americans would be content with the abolition of the ſtamp-act at that time; and with aſſurances, that the legiſlative authority was then ſuſpended with full deſign to prepare the way for abſolutely re-

ſcinding it at another. And that the declaratory act had no farther meaning than to ſilence their opponents in parliament, who would otherwiſe have prounounced them to have ſacrificed the dignity of the kingdom, in order to preſerve themſelves in place, power, and accumulation of riches. Who are now the mumpers, that with a ſore leg implored the provinces to be quiet? Where was the remembrance of this ignominious act, when this orator calumniated the preſent miniſtry with that *mumping* meanneſs which they never committed? And now, having reſtored the *ſore leg* to its proper *body*, I leave him to cure it as he may.

He now proceeds to aſcertain the quietneſs of the province of the Maſſachuſets, and adds, "on "the requiſition for compenſation to thoſe who "had ſuffered from the violence of the populace, "in the ſame addreſs they ſay, the recommenda-"tion enjoined by Mr. ſecretary Conway's letter, "and in conſequence thereof made to us, we will "embrace the firſt opportunity to conſider and "act upon." With what egregious indignities did this miniſtry diſgrace the executive power of the Britiſh legiſlature! They not only ſneaked from before the rebels, but condeſcended to make a requiſition, for a compenſation of the violences they had committed; and thereby renounced that right of legally obtaining it, which the laws have beſtowed on every Britiſh ſubject. Were all things quiet at that time in that province? Notwithſtanding this anſwer, ſo evaſive of the requiſition, the orator pronounces, "they did conſider, they "did act upon it, they obeyed the requiſition; "it was ſubſtantially obeyed. The damages of "popular fury were *compenſated by legiſlative gra-*

"*vity.*"

"*vity*." Ah! what a compenſation was here? Did legiſlative gravity compenſate for univerſal inſurrections? No. Did it compenſate for the violence of ſeizing and burning the ſtamped papers? No. Did it compenſate for the outrage of forcing officers to reſign their commiſſions under the gallows? No. Did it compenſate for pulling down and rifling the houſes of magiſtrates? No. Did it compenſate for the expulſion from their country, of all thoſe who dared to ſpeak or write a ſingle word in defence of the power of parliament? No. For what did it then make compenſation? For *nothing*. Surely ſo ridiculous an aſſertion was never ſeriouſly uttered by human lips before this time! Sir John Falſtaffe, jocularly indeed, makes a defence, which in its import, is not unlike it. When the prince ſays to the knight, "ſirrah, do I owe you a thouſand pounds?" he replies, "A thouſand pounds, Hal! thy *love* is worth a *million*; thou oweſt me thy love." In this manner you muſt eſtimate the *legiſlative gravity* of the Americans, or the *injured* have gone *without* compenſation.

To this unexampled ſtroke of proving what he had aſſerted, he adds, "I am bold to ſay, that ſo "ſudden a calm, recovered after ſo violent a "ſtorm, is without parallel in hiſtory." After his boldneſs in ſaying the former, what may we not expect from ſuch boldneſs? As to the *calm*, if there were any, it muſt have been *during* the *ſtorm*. For it has been already proved, that the ſtorm did never ſubſide. An aſſertion of that kind would be nothing unuſual in that orator, who has repreſented things paſt and preſent, and even impoſſibilities, to have exiſted together.

"And

" And now," ſays he, " I hope the gentleman " has received a fair and full anſwer to his queſ- " tions." And I, in my turn, hope the ſpeaker has received a fair and full refutation of his aſſertions. Which of us hath ſucceeded in his endeavour, I reſign to your determination.

" I have done," ſays he, " with the third pe- " riod of your policy, that of the repeal, and the " return of the ancient ſyſtem, and ancient tran- " quility and concord." To the policy of the repeal, and the return of tranquility, I ſhall ſay no more. " This period," adds he, " was not ſo " long as it was happy." Short as it was, it was longer than it was happy. For it is evident, that happineſs it had none. Or there is no evidence in facts. In reality, the manifeſtations of impotence, were ſo conſpicuous in this miniſtry; the neceſſity of more able heads ſo urgent; and the deriſion of their conduct ſo univerſal; that they rather walked out of power, from a conſciouſneſs of inſufficiency to diſcharge their duty, than were diſſmiſſed from adminiſtration.

He now informs you, " the ſtate," *not* in the condition he has deſcribed it, " was delivered into " the hands of Lord Chatham, a great and cele- " brated name; a name that keeps the name of " this country reſpectable in every other on the " globe." It may be called,

——— clarum et venerabile nomen
Gentibus, et multum noſtræ quod proderat urbi.

Which being interpreted, may ſignify, a name famous and venerable in all other nations, and which hath coſt his country ſeventy millions of money.

" The

" The venerable age of this great man, his " merited rank, his ſuperior eloquence, his ſplen- " did qualities, his eminent ſervices, the vaſt ſpace " he fills in the eye of mankind; and more than " all the reſt, his fall from power, which, like " death, canonizes and ſanctifies a great character, " will not ſuffer me to *cenſure* any part of his con- " duct; I am afraid to flatter him; I am ſure " I am not *diſpoſed* to *blame* him."

Till now I never heard, that any man could be canonized by a *fall*, before he was dead; nor that *death* hath ever canonized a character. Is death a pope?

Let us examine how faithfully he obſerves his promiſes. He continues: " For a wiſe man, he " ſeemed to me to be governed too much by ge- " neral maxims. One or two of theſe maxims, " flowing from an *opinion* not the moſt *indulgent* " to our *unhappy ſpecies*, and ſurely a little too " general, led him into *meaſures* that were greatly " *miſchievous* to himſelf, and for that reaſon, " among others, perhaps *fatal* to his *country*; " meaſures the effect of which I am afraid, are " *for ever incurable*. He made an adminiſtration " ſo checquered and ſpeckled; he put together a " piece of joinery ſo croſsly indented, and whim- " ſically dove-tailed; a cabinet ſo variouſly inlaid; " ſuch a piece of diverſified moſaic, ſuch a teſ- " ſelated pavement without cement; here a bit of " black ſtone, and there a bit of white." And thus this great man, with all the eminent qualities which this orator hath, in the preceding inſtant, aſcribed to him, is *now* reduced to be the moſt ridiculous compound that hath ever exiſted. He is a *maker* of *checquer tables*, a *ſpeckler*, a *clumſy joiner*, a *cabinet maker*, a *worker* in *moſaic*, and a *paviour*.

paviour. Qualities which muſt inevitably have made his name reſpectable, as a ſtateſman, through all the nations of the globe.

But they were not *black* and *white ſtones* only, that he put into this pavement, "patriots and "courtiers, kings friends and republicans, whigs "and tories, treacherous friends, and open ene-"mies were inſerted alſo, ſo that it was indeed a "very curious ſhow, but unſafe to touch, and "unſafe to ſtand on." Why it ſhould be unſafe to *touch* is paſt my comprehenſion, although I agree it might be too ſlippery to ſtand on.

Such is this orator's happy mode of exemplifying the ſplendid qualities and eminent ſervices of this great miniſter, who is canonized before his death; and of *his* own indiſpoſition to blame him. "The colleagues whom he had aſſembled at the "ſame board, ſtared at each other, and were ob-"liged to aſk, *Sir, your name? Sir, you have the* "*advantage of me.*——*Mr. ſuch a one.*——*I beg a* "*thouſand pardons.*" What a vein of inimitable humour runs through this deſcription! with what amazing propriety does it delineate the manners of ſuch men! what a world of veriſimilitude it bears!

"I venture to ſay," ſays he, indeed he is in all ſhapes an *adventurer*, "it did ſo happen, that per-"ſons had a ſingle office divided between them, "who had never ſpoke to each other in their lives, "until they found themſelves, they knew not "how, pigging together, heads and points, in "the ſame truckle-bed."* Theſe perſons are explained to be lord North and Mr. Cooke, who were joint

* Imitated from the 5th chapter of the Bathos. of the true genius for the profund.

joint paymaſters. The *elegance* of this paſſage is only equalled by the *pleaſantry* of the preceding. It ſeems theſe gentlemen were two *pins* with *heads* and *points*, and theſe *pins pigged* together in the ſame office, and that office was a *truckle bed*. If then, in this high office, *they* pigged in a truckle bed, muſt not lord Rockingham's *clerk*, to preſerve a proper ſubordination in miniſterial *pigging*, have *pigged under* a truckle bed?

He now proceeds to give ſuch a deſcription of lord Chatham's miniſtry, that would ſtamp on him the moſt indelible mark of want of common ſenſe that ever diſgraced a man, and at the concluſion of it he tells you, "the moſt artful and moſt powerful "of the ſet eaſily prevailed ſo as to ſeize upon the "vacant, unoccupied, and derelect minds of his "friends, and inſtantly they turned the veſſel "wholly out of the courſe of his policy, as if it "were to inſult as well as to betray him, even "long before the cloſe of the firſt ſeſſion of his "adminiſtration, when every thing was publickly "tranſacted, and with great parade in his name, "they made an act, declaring it highly juſt and "expedient to raiſe a revenue in America."

By introducing the mention of this act to raiſe a revenue in America, the true motive of reducing lord Chatham to that ſtate of mental weakneſs, in thus ſuffering the *tricks*, *treachery*, and *impoſitions* of the other miniſters is diſcloſed. This act during his adminiſtration evinces this truth; that he then diſapproved of the Rockingham repeal of the ſtamp-act, and of hanging up the ſovereignty of England without life and motion. To obviate that oblique reprehenſion of lord Chatham, the orator with a ſpirit of ingenuouſneſs and veracity becoming

coming his cauſe, hath thus traduced the character of that nobleman.

He then ſubjoins "even before this ſplendid orb was entirely ſet, and while the weſtern horizon was in a blaze with his deſcending glory, on the oppoſite quarter of the heavens aroſe another luminary, and for his hour became lord of the aſcendant." In this manner he has deſcribed the ſplendour and glory of that deſcending nobleman whom he had before in fact delineated as void of common underſtanding. In this he reſembles the profligacy of a ſon who having ſtripped his father of all his poſſeſſions, and allowing him but a ſcanty ſuſtenance, buries him at laſt with all the pomp of funeral pageantry.

This kingdom, it ſeems, was then illumined by *two ſuns* at the ſame time. Whilſt the old ſun was ſitting in blaze and glory, the new was riſing *on* the oppoſite quarter of the heavens, and thus he was getting *above* both heaven and earth, whereas all other ſuns had, and have ſince riſen *in* the heavens.

This ſecond luminary was Charles Townſhend, whoſe character he delineates as replete, not only with incongruities, but with moral impoſſibilities, as that of Mr. Grenville. "This portrait," he ſays, "was drawn becauſe the ſubject is inſtructive to "thoſe who wiſh to form themſelves on whatever "excellence has gone before them; there are many "young members in the houſe who never ſaw "that prodigy Charles Townſhend; nor of courſe "know what a ferment he was able to excite in "every thing, by the violent ebulition of his "mixed virtues and failings." In this manner this benignant orator aſſumes the office of *youth's parliamentary guide*, deſcribes Mr. Townſhend as

yeaſt

yeaſt that ſets all things in *fermentation*, and recommends him as an *excellence* to be *imitated*.

" But, adds he, he had no failings which were " not owing to a noble cauſe, to an ardent, ge- " nerous, perhaps an immoderate paſſion for fame, " a paſſion which is the *inſtinct* of all great ſouls." Is the love of fame *the inſtinct*, ſhould it not be *inſtinctive* in all great ſouls? " He worſhipped that " goddeſs whereſoever ſhe appeared, but he paid " his particular devotions to her in her favorite " habitations, in her choſen temple, the houſe of " commons." This I believe is the firſt inſtance of that houſe being conſidered as the *favourite* habitation and *choſen temple* of fame. It has been called the *temple* of *corruption*, a *chriſtian chapel* converted to a *den* of *thieves*, and diſtinguiſhed by other ſuch appellations. But I believe the orator is right in this new denomination. Becauſe it is ſituated exactly as the temple of fame was among the ancients. *Weſtminſter Hall* is the *temple* of *virtue* that leads to it.

He then adds, " that *beſides* the characters of " the individuals that compoſe their body, it is " impoſſible not to obſerve that this houſe has a " collective character of its own." This is, in plain Engliſh, that the members have one character and the houſe another. " That character " too, however imperfect, is not unamiable. Like " all great public collections of men, they poſſeſs " a marked *love* of *virtue*, and *abhorrence* of *vice*." And this being a character *beſides*, or *more than* is in them as *individuals*, they are, as ſingle men, moſt abominable profligates; and in the aggregate the moſt meritorious of human beings. And thus by a ſingular phœnomenon in moral nature, *each* of them clubs his *quota* of what *neither* of them *poſ-*

ſeſſes.

ſeſſes. However, this is rare news for poor old England. We can have nothing now to dread from ſo virtuous a body. Corruption is dead. *Liberty* and *property*, *roaſt beef* and the *lord's prayer* are for ever ſecured.

He now gives you a diſſertation on the vice of obſtinacy, and exemplifies it in his own oration. To this he adds, "that Mr. Townſhend voted for the "ſtamp-act, voted for the repeal of it, and then "voted for the tax on tea, &c." And that he followed the example of thoſe ſpeakers in the houſe, "who had no opinions, no principles, no "order nor ſyſtem in their policy, no ſequel or "connection in their ideas, as far as it could be "diſcovered by their harangues. That he was a "candidate for contradictory honours, and his "great aim was to make thoſe agree in admiration "of him, who never agreed in any thing elſe." What this gentleman can mean by contradictory honours I cannot conceive. How can any thing that *contradicts honour* be *honour* in *itſelf*, any more than that which *contradicts truth* can be *verity*. However, one of theſe honours is changing opinion with the times. Imitating the unintelligible in ſpeaking is another. And theſe are, I ſuppoſe, among the particular excellences on which this *youth's guide* would inſtruct the young members to form themſelves.

There is one inſtance of Mr. Townſhend's great excellence, in winning the hearts of the members, which is too conſpicuous and inſtructive to be omitted; as it is probably the only way that one in a hundred is able to win them. "*He hit the* "*houſe juſt between wind and water.*" In this inſtance of metaphoric tranſcendency, the *force of genius can no further go.* This image, with moſt

moſt remarkable propriety, and equally inimitable decency is taken from the ſong of

A tinker and a taylor,
A ſoldier and a ſailor ;
Had once a doubtful ſtrife, ſir,
To make a maid a wife, ſir,
Whoſe name was buxom Joan, &c.
The ſailor let fly at her,
And *hit 'twixt wind and water*,
Which *won* the fair maid's *heart*.

By this ſuperlative figure, five hundred and fifty-ſeven *men* are converted into one *buxom Joan*. Mr. Townſhend is made her gallant, and repreſented in the actual exerciſe of winning her heart by a ſtroke *'twixt wind* and *water*. Without the obſcene application, the words *'twixt wind* and *water* to the fair maid, the *heart winning hit* is totally unintelligible. For if the houſe be ſuppoſed to be a ſhip, and the members her crew, a ſhot 'twixt *wind* and *water*, being the moſt dangerous that can be given, can never *win* their *hearts*.

As this unexampled idea of winning the houſe, deſerves to be eternally preſerved, I would willingly hope that the right honorable John Wilkes, Eſq; lord mayor of London ; and member for the county of Middleſex, will move that, at the public expence, it be exhibited in bronze; a proper metal for him to recommend, and peculiarly adapted for the preſervation of ſo chaſte an imagery. May not the fair maid be diſtinguiſhed by the ſpeakers robes and great wig; the mace under her head, and the journals of the houſe compoſing the couch on which the operation is performing, by Mr. Townſhend habited in the robes of chancellor of the exchequer ? may it not ſerve alſo as an archetype for a frontiſpiece to the

next edition of his lordſhip's moſt pious eſſay on woman? And now I beg leave to aſk whether this *winning bit* of Mr. Townſhend might not have engaged the orator's fancy, when *he carried his argument irreſiſtibly into the body both of the parliament and miniſtry*. He then tells you the repeal began to be *in* as bad an odour in the houſe, as the ſtamp-act had been in the ſeſſion before. It did indeed ſtink moſt abominably in the noſtrils of all men of underſtanding. But as an *egregious ſtink* is conſidered as a *ſource of the ſublime* by this ſpeaker, that could have formed no objection to its merit.* "Mr. "Townſhend moved for the act which placed the "duties on tea, white lead, &c. and it was car-"ried." And no mention is made of the duke of Grafton's being at the head of the treaſury. May it not have happened, therefore, from the over ſcrupulous delicacy of this orator, that he abſtained, on this occaſion, from mentioning his *grace*, as *he* might conceive that miniſter had been amply calumniated by *Junius?*

There is one paſſage which it would be unjuſt in me to omit, as it proves that this ſpeaker is undeviatingly uniform in the manner of his figurative expreſſions. "While the houſe hung in "this uncertainty, now the *hear hims* roſe from "this ſide, now *they re-bellowed* from the other." And thus the *ſounds* which roſe on one ſide were converted into *perſons* on the other, and *re-bellowed*. "And that party to whom they fell, at length, from "their *tremulous and dancing balance*, always re-"ceived them in a tempeſt of applauſe." I confeſs I do not well conceive the meaning of this *tremulous* and *dancing ballance* from which the *hear hims fell*. Unleſs indeed pretending to be ballance maſters,

* Sublime and beautiful, ſect. 21.

maſters, and to dance the tremulous tight rope, they fell from thence into one of the parties, and were thus received in a *tempeſt* of applauſe.

The orator now returns to "lord Hillſborough "and the preſent miniſtry; revives his old ſtory; "talks of the act, ſtating that it is expedient to "raiſe a revenue in America; of a partial repeal "annihilating the greateſt part of that revenue; "of a ſecretary of ſtate diſclaiming, in the king's "name, all thoughts of ſuch a ſubſtitution in fu-"ture; and ſays that the principle of the diſclaimer "goes to what has been left, as well as what "has been repealed." A long and tedious *repetition* of what he has already *repeatedly* ſpoken, all which has been repeatedly refuted. For that reaſon you ſhall hear no more of it. And then adds he, "I ſhall vote for the queſtion which leads to the "repeal of both," that is the act which impoſed the duties, and that which took off all the others but that on tea. "He now reſumes the impor-"tance of a dictator, if you do not fall in with "this motion, then ſecure ſomething to fight for, "conſiſtent in theory and valuable in practice." Is not the legiſlative authority of this realm an object conſiſtent in theory and valuable in pactice? is not this the object to be fought for, ſhould fighting be neceſſary to ſecure it? "if you muſt employ "your ſtrength," ſays he, "employ it to uphold "you in ſome honorable right, or ſome profitable "wrong." Is not that authority an honorable right for which this ſtrength is employed? and the *preſent* miniſtry do not chuſe to deſert or to ſupport the honorable right, which the parliament conſtitutionally poſſeſſes over the Americans, by following the example of that *profitable wrong*, which was done by repealing the ſtamp-act.

" Your miniſters," ſays he, " in their own and " his majeſty's name, have already adopted the " American diſtinction of internal and external " duties. It is a diſtinction, whatever merit it " may have, that was originally moved by the " Americans themſelves." The falſity of this aſſertion hath been already evinced from governor Bernard's letters. Theſe poſitively pronounce that the coloniſts embraced it from what had been ſpoken in parliament by the miniſters whom this ſpeaker would vindicate, when they formed the oppoſition to Mr. Grenville : and this circumſtance diſcloſes the reaſon for his transferring it to the Americans. However, adds he, " I think they will acquieſce " in it, if they are not puſhed with too much " *logic*, and too little *ſenſe* in all the conſequences." And thus by a diſtinction as abſurd as that between the right of internal and of external taxation, *logic*, is made to be one thing, and *ſenſe* another. May not this opinion afford ſome reaſon for his manner of arguing?

" That is," ſays he, " if external taxation be " underſtood, as they and you underſtand it when " you pleaſe, to be not a diſtinction of geography " but of policy, that it is a power for regulating " trade and not for ſupporting eſtabliſhments." But when did it pleaſe the Americans to underſtand it in that light, until the arguments, urged againſt the ſtamp-act, were tranſmitted to them? It has been already proved from governor Bernard's letters, that, previous to that time, they underſtood no difference between external and internal duties. And when did the miniſtry underſtand that it is a *power* for regulating trade, and not for ſupporting eſtabliſhments? For indeed who can underſtand, that taxation, which is the *effect* of power, can be

the

the *power* which creates itſelf? may they not as well underſtand how a man may leap over his own ſhadow.

" This diſtinction," ſays he, " which is nothing " with regard to right, is of moſt weighty con- " ſideration in practice." Why then, when the ſtamp-act was repealed, did not that miniſter preſerve the exertion of the ſovereign authority, in that manner of external taxation, by an act of that kind? " recover your old ground, and your " old tranquility," ſays he, " try it; I am per- " ſuaded the Americans will compromiſe with " you." Shall the miniſtry, to whom the executive power is committed, compromiſe with rebels, reſpecting that allegiance by which they are bound to obey the laws: or the parliament enter into compromiſe with ſuch ſubjects reſpecting their indubitable right to ſovereign legiſlature? " conſult " and follow your experience," he adds, " let " not the long ſtory, with which I have exerciſed " your patience, prove fruitleſs to your intereſts." Experience has been followed. That experience which is derived from the daſtardly flight before rebellion, and from the repealing of the ſtamp-act. His long ſtory can have no other reaſonable effect than to refute all that he would confirm; to juſtify all that he has reprehended; and to turn the ſtomachs of all who heard or read him.

He now turns field preacher, and ſays, " all this " is in the hand of providence." And then, notwithſtanding he allows it to be in ſuch unexceptionable hands, he would perſuade the commons to prefer *his* opinion even to a truſt in *God*. For " now, even now," ſays he, " I ſhould confide " in the prevailing virtue and efficacious operation " of lenity, though working in darkneſs and in " chaos. In the midſt of all this unnatural and

" turbid combination, I ſhould hope it might pro-
" duce order and beauty in the end." But as providence produced, the order and beauty of this world, out of darkneſs and chaos, may it not be as ſafe to confide in *that* as in the *advice* of Edmund Burke, Eſq?

" Let us embrace," ſays he, " ſome ſyſtem or " other before we end this ſeſſion. Do you mean " to tax America, and to draw a *productive* re-" venue from thence?" what kind of revenue is that which *produces nothing at all?* " if you do, " ſpeak out: name, fix, aſcertain this revenue; " ſettle its quantity; define its objects; provide " for its collection; and then fight when you have " ſomething to fight for." By the permiſſion of this politician, the miniſtry are advancing in a more equitable and manly manner. They will firſt eſtabliſh the legiſlative authority to tax; reſtore, to activity, that power which the miniſter, under whom he ſerved, ſo fatally benumbed; and then fix the revenue and what relates to it. But it ſeems the ſovereign rights of the realm are nothing to fight for.

He continues, " if you do murder—rob—if " you kill, take poſſeſſion, and do not appear in " the character of madmen as well as aſſaſſins, " violent, vindictive, bloody and tyranical with-" out an object." Has not every precaution been taken, and every lenient meaſure carried into execution to prevent bloodſhed and deprivation of property? in what æra, in what nation, by what ſovereign have ſuch manifeſtations of lenity, and ſlowneſs to wrath been given? and if at length the ſword alone muſt ſubdue the rebellious and fanatic revolt of theſe Americans, will it be *murder* to ſlay the *rebel*; or *robbery* to take his *poſſeſſions?* can a ſovereign,

ſovereign, his parliament, and miniſters on ſuch conduct be deemed to be *violent*, *vindictive*, *bloody*, and *tyrannical aſſaſſins?* no——the blood of thoſe who may be ſlain will be on the heads of that miniſtry who, apoſtates from their country's cauſe, inflamed them to rebellion. And this ſpeaker may reſt aſſured, that better councils will guide them, than *he* has given, or can give. "Leave "America to tax herſelf, leave the Americans as "they anciently ſtood, and theſe diſtinctions, "born of our unhappy conteſt, will die along "with it. They and we, and their and our an-"ceſtors have been happy under that ſyſtem. Let "the memory of all actions, in contradiction to "that good old mode, on both ſides be extin-"guiſhed for ever." Such is the inſidious voice of the hyena, which imitating the plaintive wailings of a child, enſnares the traveller to liſten and be devoured. The true meaning of it is, follow the ſteps of me and my miniſter, and reſtore us to ſome degree of credit by proving, that you, the preſent miniſters, are incapable of being admoniſhed by the miſdeeds which we have committed.

If you, my fellow-ſubjects, ſtill preſerve your reaſon, thus it muſt appear. If you are ſuſceptible of ſenſation, you will feel this inſult on your underſtandings. If you value your rights, happineſs, and claim to equal freedom, you will reſent this inſidiouſneſs to deprive you of them. If you are men, you will ſupport your king, his parliament, his miniſters, and your country's dignity. Abhor and renounce, therefore, all thoſe who have ſo long ſeduced you to become the abettors of rebellion!

He then adds, "be content to bind America "by laws of trade, you have always done it; "let this be your reaſon for binding their trade." But will you bind yourſelves to be their ſlaves, and to work for their eaſe and opulence? The very tax he labours to repeal, is a tax on trade. The like has been repeatedly impoſed from their firſt charter, in the reign of King William, to this hour, as he has acknowledged, "do not burthen them by "taxes, you were not uſed to do ſo from the be- "ginning. Theſe are the arguments of ſtates and "kingdoms." What ſtate or kingdom did ever argue in that way, and practiſe in conſequence thereof? Becauſe, in the infant ſtate of a colony, when the conſtituents were few, embarraſſed with the difficulties of a new ſettlement in providing food, raiment, and ſhelter from the weather, they were left untaxed. Becauſe they were ſo permitted to remain, during the encouragement which was given, by this their mother country, in their rapid progreſs to happineſs and wealth Are they after millions have been ſpent, thouſands and ten thouſands of your fellow ſubjects ſlaughtered, to procure and eſtabliſh them in ſecurity, ſtill to be left untaxed? do *ſtates* and *kingdoms argue* that becauſe their colonies paid *nothing* in tax, when they had *nothing* to pay it with, that therefore when they *overflow with a redundance of riches*, they ſtill ought to continue untaxed by that very ſovereign authority which cheriſhed, encouraged, and ſuſtained them during all their difficulties and wars? That authority which they never diſallowed; to which they conſtantly applied for aſſiſtance; and from whence they as conſtantly received it? What *kingdom*,

what

what *ſtate*, hath ever *argued* in that prepoſterous manner? or what orator, but this, hath ever conceived them capable of offering arguments ſo repugnant to every idea of common ſenſe? Yet ſuch is the opinion of this celebrated ſpeaker, who in every paragraph, even in his affected humilities, evinces that he preſumes himſelf ſufficient to the guidance of a kingdom. Hence ariſe his peremptory advice, his virulent reprehenſion, and his illiberal confidence in delivering his ſentiments.

"But," ſays he, "if intemperately, unwiſely, "fatally, you ſophiſticate and poiſon the very "ſource of government, by urging ſubtle de-"ductions, and conſequences odious to thoſe you "govern, from the unlimited and illimitable na-"ture of ſupreme ſovereignty, you will *teach* them "by theſe means to call that ſovereignty itſelf in "queſtion." This is indeed a ſingular and a pleaſant ſuppoſition. Deductions are made a *new* kind of *poiſon*; and then theſe *deductions* are drawn from the nature of *ſupreme ſovereignty*, to *poiſon* the *ſource* of government, which is drawing *poiſon* from a *thing* to *poiſon* itſelf. But that the Americans ſhould now *be to be taught* to call that ſovereignty in queſtion, after they have been ſo long inſtructed by this gentleman and his aſſociates, and are in actual rebellion againſt it, is really a ſingular ſuppoſition. And now he acknowledges this very ſovereignty to be *unlimited* and *illimitable*. The contrary of which he has repreſented in both reſpects, with regard to America.

"If that ſovereignty and their freedom." ſays he, "can not be reconciled, which will they take? "They will caſt your ſovereignty in your face." But on what does he found this *if?* It is on this very

very ſovereignty, and this exertion of it, the right to be taxed by parliament alone, that we in Britain found our *freedom*. How comes it to paſs, that what conſtitutes the liberty of Britons, can be irreconcileable with that of America? And as to their caſting it in our face, that they have done already. "No body will be argued into ſlavery," ſays he. But every ſubject ought to be compelled to his allegiance. "Let the gentlemen on the other "ſide call forth all their ability; let the beſt of "them get up and tell me, what one character of "liberty the Americans have, and what one brand "of ſlavery they are free from, if they are bound "in their property and induſtry by all the re-"ſtraints you can imagine, on commerce, and "induſtry; by all the reſtraints you can imagine "at the ſame time are made pack-horſes of "every tax you chooſe to impoſe, without "the leaſt ſhare in granting them."

In this page is there not a ſmall miſtake of *ſlavery* for *petty larceny*, in the term *brand*? Nevertheleſs, I will allow him, "*if* the Americans be ſo bound by all imaginable reſtraints on commerce, and made pack-horſes to carry every tax that may be impoſed on them," that they will be ſlaves indeed. But is a tax of *three-pence* a pound on tea, a reſtraint on commerce that binds their induſtry and property; when, by that tax, they are eaſed of four times that ſum, which they paid before? and are they made pack-horſes of *every* tax by carrying that *one*? As to their being without the leaſt ſhare in granting them, in that inſtance they ſtand exactly as five millions and half out of ſix millions of this kingdom indiſputably ſtand.

He then adds: "When they bear the burthens "of unlimited monopoly, will you bring them to

"bear

" bear the burthens of unlimited revenue too?" I have fully diſproved the unlimited monopoly already; and if their revenues be no more oppreſſive than *that*, they will be the freeſt people under heaven. " The Engliſhman in America will " feel this is ſlavery.——That it is *legal* ſlavery, " will be no compenſation either to his feelings " or his underſtandings." What an *Engliſhman, born in America*, may feel, I can not tell. But if he do not feel ſlavery but from unlimited monopoly and unlimited revenue, he and his progeny will be free for ever.

He then ſays, " Lord Carmarthen, who ſpoke " ſome time ago, is full of the fire of ingenuous " youth; and when he has modelled the ideas of " a lively imagination, by farther experience, " he will be an ornament to his country in either " houſe." I have ſome doubts whether the ideas of this nobleman's imagination may want modelling. My reaſon is, that this orator, in all his arguments, narrative, ſimiles, metaphors, hyperboles, and tropes has ſhewn, to demonſtration, that he is incapable of modelling ideas. But if his lordſhip ſhould be in that want, I need not intreat him *not* to place Mr. Burke for his *model*. For if he ſhould, is it not evident, that he can never become an ornament to his country either in or out of the houſes?

" This lord, however, ſays, that the Americans " are our children, and how can they revolt againſt " their parent? he ſays, if they are not free in " their preſent ſtate, England is not free; Be- " cauſe Mancheſter, and other conſiderable places, " are not repreſented. So then, becauſe ſome " towns in England are not repreſented, America " is to have no repreſentatives at all?" But I

ſhall

ſhall preſume to prove, that the Americans are as much *repreſented* as the people of Great Britain, and are in poſſeſſion of every right, reſpecting the election of members to ſerve in parliament, that Britons enjoy. It is univerſally allowed, that not more than a tenth part of this people have an elective right in the returning of members to parliament; and it is equally certain, that theſe members, being returned, are inſtantly become the repreſentatives of *all* the ſubjects, though elected by the *few*; that they are as equally obliged to protect the welfare, and promote the intereſts of the former as the latter. An application to the repreſentatives in parliament, is as much the right of the non-electors, and as uniformly attended to as that of the others. The Americans have always enjoyed, equally with yourſelves, this common right of being repreſented. And in conſequence thereof, they have applied to parliament, and received the aids of money, fleets, and armies. How then are they unrepreſented more than all others who have no elective right? But it has been ſaid, that all Britons may legally become electors; they are not excluded from that privilege as the Americans are. This aſſertion is founded on a like baſis of untruth with the former. Every American poſſeſſes this privilege, equally with every Engliſhman. If he enjoy an hereditary freehold of forty ſhillings a year in England, or if he purchaſe it, he votes as either of you in the like ſituation. If either by the right of ſervitude, purchaſe, or preſentation, he be free of the livery of London; or a freeman of any city or town corporate, where freedom gives a vote, he there enjoys the right of election equally with

with you. Let him purchaſe a burgage tenure, or pay ſcot and lot, he votes from thoſe rights: and every mode of obtaining that privilege, in all places and reſpects, is equally open to him as to you. In conſequence of theſe rights, we have ſeen Trecothick lord mayor of London, Sayre and Lee ſheriffs, all born in America. In the laſt parliament Trecothick and Huſke were members, Cruger in this, all Americans born; beſides a multitude of others whom the ſugar iſlands have furniſhed for that purpoſe. Thus it ſeems, with every right of Engliſhmen, they ſtill complain that they are precluded. And whilſt this orator, and others of a like ſtamp, are *exclaiming* againſt taxing theſe Americans, becauſe they are not repreſented, they prove by thoſe very *exclamations* that they are. For what does repreſentation include more than parliamentary proceedings in this manner? And what ſeems not a little ſingular, thoſe American-born members, whilſt they deny the parliamentary right of taxing *themſelves* in America, do without heſitation preſume to tax *you* in Britain.

There is yet another plea which is urged in their favour: that they are taxed without their own conſent; and may therefore be taxed to any exceſs the parliament ſhall pleaſe. By whoſe conſent are you taxed in England? Is it by that of the electors? No. For they are never conſulted on the impoſition of any tax. Is the delegation of that authority to raiſe money, given by the few who chooſe, to thoſe that are choſen, adequate to the whole community's being taxed by their own conſent? Since five millions and half, of the ſix in Britain, are not concerned in that conſent of choice, can the Americans juſtly complain of not

poſ-

poſſeſſing that choice, who are in the ſame predicament?

As an objection, to the right of parliamentary taxation, it is urged, that the Americans may be taxed when the Britons are not. Have not you been taxed *without* them, from their origin to this day; more particularly during the laſt war, to ſuch an enormous degree, that you were mortgaged for ſeventy millions of money to defend their properties; whilſt they were raiſing what ſums *they pleaſed only*, and for their own protection in America alone? But if that mode, of being taxed *without* you, be grievous; let all future taxes be extended through the colonies, and that complaint muſt ceaſe. Appeal to this ſpeaker's deſcription of their happineſs and wealth, you will find they can afford it equally with you.

Such being the true ſtate of the Americans, of what does this arbitrary oppreſſion conſiſt, againſt which the virulence of licentious obloquy is ſo egregiouſly let looſe? Where is the illegality; where the injuſtice in the exertion of the ſovereign authority to lay duties on the Coloniſts? But "they are "*our children*; and when children aſk for *bread*, "are we to give a ſtone?" When was this *aſking* of *bread* returned by giving them a *ſtone?* Have they aſked for repreſentatives? —— Have they not declared in the congreſs, they will have none? Is the *ſtone* applicable in this inſtance? But when children are refractory; renounce their duty; and even oppoſe their parent with force, are they not to be chaſtiſed and brought back to obedience?

"When this child of ours, ſays he, wiſhes to aſſi-"milate to its parent and to reflect, with a true filial "reſemblance, the beauteous countenance of Bri-

"tiſh

" tiſh liberty ; are we to turn to them the *ſhame-*
" *ful* parts of our conſtitution ? are we to give
" them our weakneſs for their ſtrength ; our op-
" probrium for their glory, and the ſlough of
" ſlavery, which we are not able to work off, to
" ſerve them for their freedom ?" But when will this child wiſh to become aſſimilated into one ſubſtance with its parent ? Are diſobedience to the laws ; a congreſs, ſubverting not only the conſtitution of the colonies, but of Great Britain alſo ; which acts with legiſlative power ; annuls the ſtatutes of this kingdom, and erects itſelf into the eſtabliſhing of what they pleaſe ; Are the ſeizing of the public money, and taking arms againſt this parent, the tokens of wiſhing to aſſimilate ? Is this the mode " of reflecting, with a true filial reſemblance, the beauteous countenance of Britiſh liberty ?" To turn to them our *backſides*, when they ſhall return to their duty, will be as culpable as were this orator and aſſociates, when they turned thoſe *ſhameful* parts to them ; and fled to repeal the ſtamp-act, &c. But it ſeems this *beauteous* countenance of *true* Britiſh liberty, is compoſed of *weakneſs*, *opprobrium*, and *ſlavery*, the *ſlough* of which we are unable to work off ? How *beautiful* is this countenance ! how *true* this liberty ! And yet, all the *weakneſs*, *diſgrace*, and *ſlavery* of this conſtitution, are to be imparted by an *exertion* of that *right*, which we in England eſtimate as our *ſtrength*, *dignity*, and *freedom* ; that of being *taxed* by the *parliament alone*.

" If this be the caſe," ſays he, " aſk yourſelves
" this queſtion, will they be content in ſuch a
" ſtate of ſlavery ?" Such ſlavery as he himſelf has

has denominated *true Britiſh liberty*. The very ſtate in which you ſtand. Can *you* be *free* and *they* be *ſlaves*, under the ſame legiſlative power, and popular rights? let the Orator reconcile this contradiction if he can? let him, in juſtice to truth, and to you, ſing his *palinodia*, recant his oration, and prove that, by confeſſing his miſtakes, he intended no miſchief to this country? or, let the criminality of his ſpeech reſt upon him. You will be no more deluded by *ſounds* to oppoſe the *ideas* of truth; and to acquieſce in the ſubjection, of this kingdom and of your own rights, to the rebels of America.

"If not, look to the conſequences," ſays he, look to't, for thunder will do't. "Reflect how "you are to govern a people who think they "ought to be free, and think they are not." The parliament and the miniſtry are now engaged in looking to the true means of recovering a people from the delirium of thinking they are *not free* in the midſt of *freedom*.

"And ſuch is the ſtate of America," he adds, "that after wading up to your eyes in blood, you "could only end where you began, that is, to "tax where no revenue is to be found." Is there no revenue to be found in countries overflowing with commerce, in the midſt of eaſe and plenty, as he has deſcribed them? where then are they to be ſought for? but as by all the preceding parts of this ſpeech you are convinced of the futility of his judgment on things *paſt*; would it not be an egregious abſurdity to liſten to his *prediction* of things to come? "Lo,---my voice fails me," ſays he, "my inclination, indeed, carries me no far-"ther. All is confuſion beyond it." And *before*

it

it too. Hartſhorn! hartſhorn! for the Orator! he faints ---he revives---heaven be praiſed---he ſpeaks again.

" Well, I have recovered a little, and before I " ſit down, I muſt ſay ſomething to another point, " with which gentlemen urge us." Out with it then, " What is to become of the declaratory " act, aſſerting the *entireneſs* of the Britiſh legiſ- " lative authority, if we abandon the practice of " taxation?" This is a queſtion which, I think, a wiſe man would never have propoſed, unleſs it be wiſdom to ſet a trap to catch himſelf?

" For my part," ſays he, " I look upon the " rights ſtated in that act, exactly in the manner " in which I viewed them on its very firſt propo- " ſition, and which I have often taken the liberty, " with *great humility*, to lay before you." His *humility* is great, indeed. " I look upon the im- " perial rights of Great Britain, and the privi- " leges which the colonies ought to enjoy under " theſe rights, to be juſt the moſt reconcileable " things in the world. The parliament of Great " Britain ſits at the head of her extenſive empire " in *two* capacities; one as the local legiſlature " of this iſland, providing for all things at home, " and by no other inſtrument than the executive " power. The other, and I think, her nobler ca- " pacity, is, what I call her imperial character; " in which, as from the throne of heaven, ſhe ſu- " perintends all the inferior legiſlatures and guides, " and controuls them all without annihilating any." Thus the *entireneſs* of the Britiſh legiſlative authority, conſiſts of *two diſtinct parts, and are juſt the moſt reconcileable things in the world.* This, however, is the capacity in which ſhe *ſits*, as well *reſpecting* England as the *colonies*. She ſuperintends, guides, and controuls all the ſeveral inferior legiſ-

latures, which have been granted to the corporations of this realm, by patents from the crown; in which predicament exactly and alone the colonies do really ſtand. And therefore, as this ſpeaker declares, "all theſe provincial legiſlatures ought "to be ſubordinate to the parliament, elſe they "can neither preſerve mutual peace, nor hope "for mutual juſtice; nor effectually afford mutual "aſſiſtance. It is neceſſary to coerce the negli-"gent, to reſtrain the violent, and to aid the "weak and deficient by the over-ruling plenitude "of her power." The executive power which had been annihilated by abrogating the ſtamp act, and the legiſlative which had been virtually aboliſhed by the declaratoy, were both of them called into action by the ſtatute which laid the duty on tea. It is, therefore, indiſputably right, according to this opponent, that this legiſlative authority ſhould be eſtabliſhed; becauſe it is eſſential to the conſtitution. It is neceſſary that it ſhould be ſupported by every means of government; becauſe the Americans deny that right, and are in rebellion againſt it. The orator, therefore, hath abſolutely refuted all that he has urged before. He hath confirmed the rectitude of that meaſure, which he has ſo vehemently decryed. He hath ſhewn the neceſſity of that law which he has laboured to repeal. He hath juſtified all that the miniſtry have done, and are doing. And he hath expoſed his own imbecility, or perfidiouſneſs of oppoſition, by ultimately coinciding with their meaſures.

"However, ſays he, the Britiſh parliament is "never to intrude into the place of the others, "whilſt they are equal to the common ends of "their inſtitution." It never did. It does not at preſent. The *common end* of their inſtitution

is

is to provide for their provincial expences, as is that of the corporate bodies of England. But the *univerſal* end is that of contributing, in due proportions, to the ſupport of the Britiſh empire; and this no corporation by patent can do. And, then, in contradiction to all that he has been labouring to effect, he ſays, "in order to enable "parliament to anſwer all theſe provident and "beneficent ſuperintendance, her power muſt be "boundleſs." Thus he proceeds even to defeat what his own party have advanced. And to ſhew the inefficacy of requiſition to the colonies he adds, "the gentlemen, ſays he, who think the powers of "parliament limited, may pleaſe themſelves to "talk of requiſitions. But ſuppoſe theſe requiſitions are not obeyed? what? ſhall there be no "reſerved power in the empire to ſupply a deficiency which may weaken, divide, and diſſipate "the whole? we are engaged in a war; the ſecretary of ſtate calls upon the colonies to contribute; ſome would do it; I think moſt would "chearfully furniſh whatever is demanded. One "or two, ſuppoſe, hang back, and eaſing themſelves, let the ſtreſs of the draft lie on the others, "ſurely it is proper that ſome authority might legally ſay, *Tax yourſelves for the common ſupply, or "parliament will do it for you.*"

But he and the advocates for requiſition ſhould know that no ſervant of the king can legally apply for national ſupplies, to the colonies. It would be an extent of the prerogative equally criminal with raiſing money by proclamation. It would be deſtroying the moſt eſſential liberty of Magna Charta, and other innumerable laws; it would be laying taxes without conſent of parliament. Nor would the miſchief end there. Such a requiſition for ſup-

plies would at once impart a legiſlative right to the Americans of raiſing and refuſing aids, if parliament ſhould acquieſce in that application. For the very eſſence of a requiſition ſuppoſes a right inherent in thoſe to whom it is made, of granting or refuſing what may be aſked. Otherwiſe it is an arbitrary demand. If they refuſe, ſays the orator, then the parliament is to compel them. Thus you are firſt to give them the liberty both of granting and refuſing; and then *compel* them to *grant* if they *dare* to exert their *right* to refuſe. This is the liberty which he is contending to eſtabliſh in America. This would, indeed, be *ſlavery* embittered by the conſideration of a *liberty* granted on purpoſe to be ſubverted.

He then adds, "this ought to be no ordinary "power, nor ever uſed in the firſt inſtance." The power of parliament is no ordinary power. And it *cannot* be uſed but in the *firſt* inſtance; as is evidently manifeſt. "This, ſays he, is what I meant "when I have ſaid, at various times, that I con-"ſider the power of taxing in parliament as an "inſtrument of empire, and not as a means of "ſupply." This is a diſtinction ſo refined, that it is either totally unintelligible; or ſo ridiculous, that it cannot be ſufficiently derided. "The *power* of *taxing* in parliament is *not* a *means* of *raiſing a ſupply*, but an *inſtrument* of empire." And to what can empire apply that *inſtrument* but to raiſe a *ſupply?* Thus according to him, that, which the *inſtrument* can *only* do is *not* its buſineſs. And an axe for hewing wood is for the ſame reaſon not an inſtrument of cutting, altho' it be applicable to no other purpoſe.

And now he tells you, "ſuch is his idea of "the conſtitution of the Britiſh empire, as diſtinguiſhed from the conſtitution of Britain." And thus

thus this realm hath *two* conſtitutions. The ſecond needleſs, and never till now conceived; or *one diſtinguiſhed* from *itſelf*; which *diſtinction* is to the full as ingenious as the *exception* of *America* to *itſelf*.

However, he gives you his opinion, "that on "theſe grounds ſubordination and liberty may be "ſufficiently reconciled through the whole; whe-"ther to ſatisfy a refining ſpeculatiſt, or a factious "Demagogue, he knows not, but enough, ſure-"ly, for the eaſe and happinnſs of man." That is, by the prudent addition of turning that *liberty*, which the Americans *now* enjoy in common with all other Britons, of being taxed by the legiſlative authority, into a ſtate of being *compelled* to pay what they would then have a *right* to *refuſe*. Such are his ideas of liberty and legiſlature. And now to your judgment I appeal, "whether he has "ſhewn to Mr. Cornwal, that you are to loſe no-"thing by complying with the motion, to repeal "the tea act, except what you have loſt already." When by that compliance you muſt flee from the face of rebels who diſpute the ſovereign authority. Hath "he ſhewn that in time of peace you flou-riſhed in commerce?" What prevents it at preſent but the rebellion which hath been excited by the harangues of faction in parliament? "you "had ſufficient aid from the colonies, while you "purſued your antient policy." Whence then did it arrive that you ſpent ſo many millions in their defence even in America? "were all things thrown "into confuſion by the ſtamp act?" when that confuſion aroſe from decrying in parliament the right to tax America internally: and that it was not only kept alive but encouraged, "when it was "repealed, is irrefragable?" "what bad effects "has the revival of the ſyſtem of taxation pro-

duced? what univerſal evil has the partial repeal effected? but ſuch as evidently flow from that fountain which had been polluted by the oppoſition in parliament; and which, according to the opinion of this very man, ought to have been undertaken to ſupport that legiſlative authority which Britain does poſſeſs, and which he and his aſſociates had virtually demoliſhed? And now, let *theſe* conſiderations, founded on facts, not one of which *he* can diſprove, confirm you in that reaſon which is ſupported by experience. Can the long and tedious harangue which hath been ſo amply proved in every ſhape, ſo nugatory and inept, be poſſibly received as a confutation of Mr. Cornwal? every paragraph which it contains pronounces the contrary.

But "on this buſineſs of America, he confeſſes "he is ſerious even to ſadneſs. He has had but one "opinion concerning it ſince and before he ſat in "parliament." In this very ſpeech has he not proved himſelf to have been of *two*? he has aſſerted, "that the very image of liberty would be loſt in America, if the colonies *were taxed by parliament*;" and he has ſaid, "that *ſuch taxation* is *abſolutely neceſſary*." But mark his modeſty, "lord North "will, as uſual, probably attribute the part taken "by *him* and his friends, in this buſineſs, to a "deſire of getting his places. Let him enjoy "that happy and original idea. If *I* deprived "him of it, ſays he, I ſhould take away moſt of "his wit and all his argument." Oh! what an exuberance of vanity is here diſplayed! Edmund Burke, from the place of clerk to lord Rockingham, looks up to the poſts of Firſt Lord of the Treaſury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer! I will not recur to the fall of Phaeton, in order to admoniſh this

this *orator* of his raſh ambition; becauſe *Phaeton* was the *ſon* of *Apollo*. Let him remember only, that pride and ambition were the downfal of Old Cole's dog. He *would* take the wall of a waggon, and was cruſhed to death. It muſt be confeſſed, indeed, that this celebrated ſpeaker does ſtand moſt egregiouſly in need of *thoſe two places*; not only for the *wit* and *argument* which they include, but for a multiplicity of other reaſons to the full as *cogent*.

I do verily believe that neither lord North, nor any man did ever conceive the ſligheſt notion, that Edmund Burke preſumed to be a candidate for the poſt of prime miniſter. It is an *original* idea, which no man hath at any time enjoyed, except that orator himſelf. But do you not tremble for the danger in which his lordſhip now ſtands? Was it not with a view of ſucceeding to his places, that Edmund Burke, with ſuch amazing propriety, threatened to impeach his lordſhip this ſeſſion of parliament? with what ſufficiency he can fill thoſe high offices, every paragraph of his ſpeech, every action in which he conducted *his own* prime miniſter, loudly declares. But ſuch, it ſeems, is his opinion of his lorpſhip's iniquities, "he had rather bear "the brunt of all his wit, and blows much hea-"vier, than ſtand anſwerable to God for embracing "a ſyſtem that tends to the deſtruction of ſome "of the very beſt and faireſt of his works." Does he mean the conſtitution of this realm? That I have ſhewn to demonſtration, he hath laboured to deſtroy; and which lord North is now engaged in reinſtating. Does he mean the liberty of the Americans? That alſo it is evident he would oppreſs, by his requiſition and his parliamentary right upon that again. In theſe circumſtances he

ſtands, and for theſe ſins he muſt anſwer to his God.

" But," ſays he, " I know the map of Eng-
" land as well as the noble lord, or any other
" perſon; and I know that the way I take, is not
" the road to preferment." The road to preferment is the *king's road*; and I ſuſpect that *he* is not indulged with a *key* to it; and let me add, for other reaſons than his *ſpeech-making*. However, " Mr. Dowdeſwell, his excellent and ho-
" nourable friend, has trod that road, with great
" toil, upwards of twenty years together. He is
" not yet arrived to the noble lord's deſtination:
" however, his tracts," ſays he, " are thoſe I ever
" wiſhed to follow; becauſe I knew they ever
" lead to honour." And to profit too, or elſe a man might wear out his old brogues without getting money to buy a new pair. Hence it is evident, that this orator is wiſhing to follow the tracts which lead to the honourable poſt of chancellor of the Exchequer. It is a modeſt ambition, may he be rewarded according to his merits.

At laſt he reverts to this declaration: " By
" *limiting* the exerciſe of parliamentary power, it
" fixes on the firmeſt foundation a real, conſiſtent,
" well-grounded authority in parliament." And thus, with contradictions to himſelf, he concludes as he began, and has proceeded. He hath already aſſerted, that this parliamentary *power* is " *illimitable*, and that it *muſt* be *boundleſs*." Thus *impoſſibilities* muſt be effected. That which is *illimitable* muſt be *limited*, " in order to fix a real, conſiſtent, and well-grounded authority in parliament."

Such is the celebrated harangue of this popular ſpeaker. He hath liſtened to the enticements of vanity;

vanity his Dalilah; he hath diſcloſed, by the publication of this ſpeech, that his force conſiſts in words alone. He hath ſlept in her lap. She hath reſcinded his ſtrength. You may bind him with a cob-web. And now let me invite you to reflect on what has been offered to your conſideration. Are you not convinced, that an inſufficiency of ſcience attends on all he offers; whether it be in polity, legiſlature, human-kind, hiſtory, commerce, or finance? Is not his talent of reaſoning devoid of all true and genuine logic? Does it fully amount to ſophiſtry; has it even the merit of that *falacious* argument? inſtead of imagination it is animal vivacity active to unite incongruous and impoſſible images in the ſame object; by which aſpiring to *ſoar*, he *precipitates* his *deſcent* into the fathomleſs *profund*. If you conſider him on the ſide of declamation, are his endeavours attended with more ſucceſs? void of ſenſibility in himſelf, his words are unimpaſſioned and uncreative of emotion in the boſoms of his hearers. He would excite averſion from the miniſtry; his language carries no ſatire, nor calls up the leaſt reſentment. He would awake compaſſion for the Americans, but every ſyllable is inexpreſſive of ſympathetic tenderneſs; it touches no heart. But in malignity without wit, in deriſion without humour, and in vanity without cauſe or bounds, he is truly great. Review him in the art of rhetoric! what is his exordium but a flounce into falſe metaphor? his *confirmation* overſets the *object* he would *ſuſtain*. And in attempting a refutation of Mr. Cornwal, he perfectly refutes himſelf? His narrative, in which the ſimple, unadorned, progreſſive line of facts ſhould be undeviatingly obſerved, he ſtuffs with falſe metaphor; and deviates into a delineation of characters, which evinces, that he is totally uninſtructed in the heart

heart and head of man; and then his evaneſcent peroration ends in a lanquid propoſal of what is impoſſible to be done; and which, were it practicable, would be ruinous to the very purpoſe that he affects to obtain.

Through his whole ſpeech, you have conſtantly before your mind the arrogance, the ſelf-ſufficient vanity of aſſuming the merit of all things to himſelf; together with that inſolent contempt for other mens abilities, which diſgrace even the orations of Cicero; but not one ray appears of that genius which illumines all his ſpeeches, and ſo amply compenſates for his diſguſting ſelf-adulation. —— Hath he not all the traſh of orator Henley, without the pleaſantry which ſometimes attended his preachments? In fact, is not his whole harangue a mere play-houſe ſtorm, that fulminates in ſounds, like thunder rumbling from the muſtard bowl, but darts no bolt; that flaſhes in falſe metaphor, like roſin through a candle, but emits no ſpark of heavenly fire?

Believe me, he will print no more ſpeeches. It is not improbable, however, that he may ſtill be babbling like a young hound, on the ſcent of every animal, from the field-mouſe that creeps among the graſs, to the ſtag that ranges in the foreſt; and he will be regarded by the Commons, as the babbler is by the pack, to whoſe openings experience has taught them to pay no attention. But if he liſten to the admonitions of unbiaſſed judgment, he will henceforth remain repentant in one eternal ſilence in parliament.

Such being the true repreſentation of this ſpeaker's merit; the objects which he and his abettors preſent to your eyes; and the ends which they would obtain, will you longer be deluded to

give

give countenance to ſchemes ſo diſhonourable to your country, and ſo ruinous to yourſelves? Your ſovereign and his miniſtry have no deſign but to alleviate your taxes and encreaſe your happineſs. On that ſubject, and for your ſakes, permit me to indulge the deſire of placing things in their true light.

That in all ſtates there muſt exiſt a ſovereign and uncontroulable power *to do right*, no man hath hitherto diſputed. It is congenial with the ſenſations of humanity. It is inſeparable from every juſt idea of national community; and in this kingdom, the authority of *doing wrong* was originally reſcinded, by the form of the conſtitution. For as you the people, by your repreſentatives, conſtitute a third eſtate in the legiſlature, it is a contradiction to common ſenſe, to conceive that you can have delegated to *them* the right of enacting what ſhall be injurious to *yourſelves*. The full power of doing what is moſt beneficial to you, is that alone which your ſovereign and his ſervants either deſire or would carry into execution. The power of inſtituting laws, without that of cauſing them to be obeyed, is an abſurdity too egregious to be ſupported. If the legiſlative authority be exerciſed with juſtice, in making laws; the executive muſt be alike ſtrenuous in their ſupport, or to what purpoſe are they made? Otherwiſe it would be a mockery of government. The principal object of all ſovereignty ſhould conſiſt in extending the ſame laws with equal impartiality over all the ſubjects of the ſtate. The next, that all theſe ſubjects ſhould contribute, both in perſon and by pecuniary aids, proportionably to their natural and adventitious abilities; becauſe a relaxation to *ſome* is conſequently an oppreſſion of *others*, which is *ſlavery* in ſome degree. Such then are the indiſputable

diſputable rights and duties of government; and ſuch as you have a right to expect from your legiſlature and your ſovereign. By theſe I will examine the conduct of his majeſty and his preſent miniſtry, towards you and the Americans.

When the ſtamp act was repealed, it appeared to men of ſound thinking, that unleſs the ſovereign authority of this realm were actually carried into the colonies, the means of alleviating your oppreſſions, by obliging them to contribute to the national ſupplies, would be entirely loſt. On that account the act for impoſing a tax on tea, &c. in America, was made. It was ſurely the duty of your repreſentatives to leſſen your burthen, by extending it on the ſhoulders of all your fellow ſubjects. It was national equity, that pecuniary aids ſhould be ſupplied by all thoſe who were as adequate to that ſupply as yourſelves, and who were not in a ſtate of general taxation. This proſpect of bringing you relief, your ſovereign ſaw with pleaſure. A ſovereign, who by devoting his conqueſts, both in the Eaſt and Weſt-Indies, to the ſervice of the ſtate, hath proved by facts, his affection for his people. His miniſters have carried theſe gracious intentions into execution. But the Americans, inſtigated by inſidious men, were thankleſs for the innumerable aſſiſtances which they had received from you, in millions ſpent, and thouſands ſlaughtered. After a war which hath ſo enormouſly encreaſed their commerce with the ceded Iſlands, and eſtabliſhed their ſecurity from their former enemies, the Canadians; Poſſeſſed of every right to the enjoyment of honours and advantage which you poſſeſs, they determined to revolt from their allegiance; refuſed obedience to the ſovereign authority; rejected the law which

was

was then made; ſet up a new government; preſevered in rebellion, and left *you* immerſed in debts contracted for *their* ſalvation. Appeal to your own hearts, and if they are not diveſted of thoſe honourable ſenſations which for ages have ſo ſignally diſtinguiſhed the race of Britons, will they not applaud the legiſlature which impoſed thoſe duties; and bleſs and aſſiſt that ſovereign and his miniſters, who by acts of unexampled mercy and forbearance, are now reducing thoſe rebels to their duty? It is *your* cauſe they now are vindicating! It is *your* eaſe they are now procuring! It is the cauſe of all poſterity in which they are now engaged! Theſe, and the dignity of the Britiſh empire, are the incentives to their conduct, and the eſtabliſhment of them is the end they would obtain. Such being the true deſigns of your king, his parliament, and his miniſters, can thoſe who would oppoſe ſuch meaſures, be the friends of Britons? By the incantation of the ſound of liberty for the Americans, they would faſcinate your intellects to aſſiſt them in their ſtruggles for power, and then deceive you!

At the acceſſion of his majeſty to the throne of theſe realms, of every twenty minutes, hours, days, and years, you laboured, twelve of that toil were waſted, in acquiring that money, which is paid in conſequence of taxes, on all the neceſſaries of life. In this wretched condition of oppreſſive ſervitude, theſe abettors of American rebellion labour to hold you ſtill enthralled. Whilſt your ſovereign, the majority of your repreſentatives, and the miniſters, are exerting every nerve to free you from the chains with which you were bound in former reigns. Can *thoſe* who would thus relentleſsly bind you to eternal toil, be the friends of *your* liberty?

Be-

Believe not me! liſten to the Americans themſelves, who from the congreſs at Philadelphia, in their addreſs to you, have ſaid: " *Know that in leſs* " *than half a century, the quit-rents reſerved to the* " *crown, from the numberleſs grants of this vaſt* " *continent, will pour large ſtreams of wealth into* " *the royal coffers*; *and if to this be added the* " *power of taxing America at pleaſure, the crown* " *will be rendered independent on you for ſupplies,* " *and will poſſeſs more treaſure than may be neceſ-* " *ſary to purchaſe the remains of liberty in your* " *iſland.*"

Oh, that the propitious day were come, that could enable his majeſty to alleviate your taxes! with what joy would it be accompliſhed! would that ſovereign, who has devoted his conqueſts to the welfare of his people, withhold his revenues from leſſening their oppreſſions? Yet ſuch is the flagitious inſult, of theſe rebels, on your underſtandings, that under the terrifying idea of the remains of liberty being to be purchaſed from you, they would delude you to unite with them; and not only withdraw *themſelves* from contributing to the national ſupplies, but prevent that royal revenue from being tranſmitted into England, for the alleviating of *your* burthens. That revenue which alone can annually diminiſh your taxes; gradually reſtore to you every moment of your labour; and apply every ſhilling which you earn, to the purchaſing of *things without taxation*. If you be men, you will manifeſt your abhorrence of *their* ingratitude and treaſon; and oppoſe with contempt and deteſtation *all their abettors*, who would delude you, to ſuſtain their intereſts, at the certainty of precluding all means of eſtabliſhing your felicity.

17 00 65

F I N I S.